

128067

JPRS-UKO-85-005

21 March 1985

# USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 17, November 1984

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**  
Approved for Public Release  
Distribution Unlimited

*DEMO QUALITY INSPECTED*

19990813 127

**FBIS**

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

7  
179  
A09

## NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

## PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

21 March 1985

# USSR REPORT

## TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 17, November 1984

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

### CONTENTS

Complete the Five-Year Plan in a Fitting Manner, Speed Up the Intensification of the Economy (K. U. Chernenko) .....	1
Constant Attention and Support for the Brigades .....	12
K. U. Chernenko's Speech at the Meeting With Leaders of Socialist Youth Organizations of Socialist Countries .....	24
Address by K. U. Chernenko to U.S. Readers .....	28
K. U. Chernenko's Answers to Questions From M. Kalb, Correspondent of the American Television Company NBC .....	30
The Real Democracy of Soviet Society (V. Sheherbitskiy) .....	33
Indissoluble Revolutionary Continuity of Generations (L. Zaykov) .....	50
Vitally Important Aspects of the Marxist Concept of Abstract Labor (A. Melent'yev) .....	66
With the Party, the People and the Country in Mind and Heart .....	82
Pioneer of the Japanese Communist Movement (A. Senatorov) .....	97
Answer to a Letter From a Fellow Inmate (Ernst Thalmann) .....	107

Who Destroyed Trust and When? On the Subject of an Unknown Letter by Niels Bohr (V. Mal'kov) .....	131
"War Alarm" in Central America (V. Nekrasov) .....	136
Honor and Glory According to Labor (Yu. Shcherbakov) .....	140
Book on the Russian Translator of "Das Kapital," Marx's Friend (L. Golovanov) .....	149
Perfecting Socialist Economic Management: Theory, Practice, Problems (V. Cherkovets) .....	154
Working Class Historian (L. Badya) .....	162
"...The Revolution Needs This" (V. Kuz'menko) .....	166
Following a KOMMUNIST Article (V. Trukhanovskiy) .....	170
Obituary of Ivan Pavlovich Pomelov .....	171
JPRS Index .....	173



PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 17  
November 1984

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author(s) :

Editor(s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : November 1982

Signed to press : 21 Nov 84

Copies : 902,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",  
"Kommunist", 1984

COMPLETE THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN IN A FITTING MANNER, SPEED UP THE INTENSIFICATION OF THE ECONOMY

PM161143 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84)  
pp 3-11

[K. U. Chernenko's speech at the 15 November 1984 CPSU Central Committee Politburo meeting]

[Text] At the meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo today, comrades, we are discussing the draft plan and budget for 1985. In many respects next year is unusual. It is the year of active preparation for the 27th CPSU Congress and of the 40th anniversary of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War. Undoubtedly, all of this imparts special political significance to the great amount of work which awaits us in the new year. It must be done under the slogan of mobilizing all forces for the successful completion of the present five-year plan and the creation of a good and solid foundation for the 12th Five-Year Plan.

Naturally, preparation of the draft plan and budget for 1985 required great efforts. An active part was played in this by the labor collectives of all economic sectors, local party, administrative and economic organs, ministries and departments and, of course, the State Planning Committee and the Ministry of Finances. The drafts have been examined in detail in the USSR Council of Ministers and in the Politburo commission for improving management and raising the efficiency of the national economy.

Now the CPSU Central Committee Politburo must review these documents and, what is particularly important, give specific form to ways of resolving the economic and social tasks for next year.

Of course, in drafting the plan and budget it was necessary to take into account both our achievements and our shortfalls. As is known, the rates of development of the national economy in 1981-82 were somewhat lower than planned for a whole series of reasons. The party made a realistic assessment of the situation and elaborated effective measures aimed at overcoming negative trends and at speeding up economic growth. Today it is possible to note with satisfaction that the economy has begun to develop more dynamically. The past 2 years have been marked by changes for the better in the work of practically all sectors of the national economy.

Take industry, for example. In 1983-84 the average annual growth in its output will have reached 32 billion rubles, which is half as much compared to the first 2 years of the five-year plan. Encouraging changes are taking place in agriculture, also. These were spoken about in detail at the CPSU Central Committee October Plenum. We all remember well the difficulties that were created by the railway transport system. Its work is now improving and one can hope that matters in that sector will continue to develop successfully. The opening of operational traffic ahead of schedule along the whole route of the Baykal-Amur Mainline--this genuinely nationwide construction project--was an outstanding event.

And the most important thing, comrades, is that the changes taking place have had a favorable effect on the living standards of Soviet people and have speeded up the increase in the population's real incomes. This is the main criterion for the correctness of the party's economic policy and for showing adherence to the elaborated line. It is also pleasing that all of these achievements are based on raising the efficiency of the national economy and improving qualitative indices.

What, then, has permitted us to achieve such results?

I believe that it is primarily the more purposeful and relevant work, by party organizations and administrative and state bodies, both at the center and in the localities in guiding economic construction.

One must also mention the energetic measures undertaken to overcome the lagging behind which had occurred in the decisive directions of economic development, figuratively speaking, to unblock bottlenecks.

There has been an intensification of the exactingness shown toward cadres at all levels. They have been made more responsible for the state of affairs in their sector, region and enterprises. Of course, the measures taken to strengthen labor and production discipline, improve the level of organization and introduce order have had their effect.

It is clear, comrades, that our efforts have been effective thanks to the nationwide support and the enthusiasm with which the working people met the measures set out by the party and the fact that they have actively struggled for their implementation. Vivid evidence of this is the businesslike response by labor collectives everywhere to the appeal by the CPSU Central Committee to achieve a 1-percent above-plan increase in labor productivity and a 0.5 percent reduction in prime costs. It must be said frankly that these were not easy tasks. However, the overwhelming majority of enterprises are coping successfully with the high-level pledges adopted.

I think that the labor collectives, workers, kolkhoz members and representatives of the intelligentsia, who have most distinguished themselves--all those who by their selfless labor have made this weighty contribution to strengthening the might of our homeland--deserve the most cordial gratitude.

We must not, however, be content with what has been achieved. Recently I have had several meetings with secretaries of central committees of union republic communist parties and party kraykoms and obkoms. The comrades spoke about how their plans are being fulfilled and about their achievements. At the same time, it was noted that here and there the mood appearing is one of placidness, complacency and a desire to lower the level of intensity of work. There must be no room for such moods. As you know, many enterprises and even certain sectors have been unable to achieve results guaranteeing stable growth in production, and have not been able to make up their lagging in all areas. This applies in particular to plan fulfillment with regard to range of output. Production capacities are still not being put into operation in a timely manner.

In a word, comrades, there is a great deal of work ahead. I would therefore like to stress most definitely that those who are still lagging behind must pull themselves together without delay; those who are coping with the plan must catch up with the frontrankers; and those who are in the forefront must not slacken their pace. In this way, by common efforts, positive progress forward in the economy must not only be consolidated, but must also be augmented.

Viewing the 1985 draft plan from this position, it may be said that overall it leads the development of the economy in the right direction. The rate of growth in the most important economic indicators has been fixed at a higher level than the average for the first 4 years, which makes it possible for the planned level for the 5-year period to be attained in a number of key areas.

In the plan, emphasis is laid on the intensification of public production. The intention is to obtain almost the entire growth in national income and 95 percent of the increase in industrial production through productivity, which signifies that, step by step, our economy is approaching the stage at which the entire production growth in the national economy will derive from increases in labor productivity.

It must be noted that the indicators on which the draft plan is based are better substantiated and interrelated. The national economic priorities and proportions are by and large consistent.

A further build-up of the country's industrial might is envisaged. Sectors in the fuel and energy complex will be substantially developed. As before, the gas industry and nuclear power generation will develop at a fast rate, but it is equally important to increase oil and coal extraction. Unfortunately, oil and coal workers have not met the planned targets so far this year. Everything possible must be done to ensure that these industries catch up as far as possible in the time that remains and that from the very first days of the new year they maintain a steady level of work.

Metallurgists also face responsible tasks in 1985. In the past we have frequently criticized them for plan failures. Now, a certain change for the better has emerged and it must be firmly consolidated, with prime concern being concentrated on improving the quality of metal and increasing variety.

It is difficult today to overestimate the role of machine building in the development of all spheres of the economy. Next year's plan sets a reliable course toward speeding up the output of new generations of machines and equipment and enhancement of the reliability of equipment. It is the duty of machine builders to meet these difficult tasks successfully.

Implementation of the Food Program is the object of tireless work by the party. The saturation of agriculture and all sectors of the agroindustrial complex with modern equipment will be boosted. Deliveries of mineral fertilizers to the countryside will also increase, but it would be fitting to consider once again the question of the amount of funds allocated for the development of the production of mineral fertilizers, taking into account the long-term requirement.

One of the key problems is capital construction. High growth rates, a great concentration of resources and better provisions of materials, machines and mechanisms are planned here. This gives us ground for hope that builders will be able to dispense with last-minute rushes, improve quality and begin at last to meet planned targets.

I would like to speak in particular about the social section of the plan. For the majority of indices here, we are reaching the level of five-year plan targets. This concerns increasing social consumption funds, and the construction of residential housing, schools, hospitals, polyclinics, kindergartens and day nurseries. In 1985 the real income of the population will increase by 3.3 percent, which is substantially higher than the average over the previous 4 years. These targets are backed up by accelerated rates of development of the "Group B" sectors of industry. The centralized increase in the salary of teachers and of a number of categories of workers in agriculture will be continued. It is planned to extend the benefits for participants in the Great Patriotic War, to begin increasing the maximum retirement pension for kolkhoz members, as well as the pension for workers and employees who took their deserved retirement more than 10 years ago. Other important measures were also outlined, among which one must single out questions connected with the implementation of the school reform.

A few words about foreign economic ties. The draft envisages their development in all directions, and naturally, with particular intensity with CEMA member countries. All the provisions arising from the decisions and agreements of the summit-level economic conference have been fully taken into consideration, and this, comrades, is not only an economic issue but also a political one. It is necessary that implementation of the adopted decisions should be constantly monitored by party, soviet and economic organs.

And, finally, the needs for strengthening the country's defense capability are duly taken into account in the plan. We cannot fail to see the increasing aggressiveness of imperialism and its attempts to achieve military superiority over the socialist community. Our country does not intend to attack anyone. This is clear to every sober-minded person. But we will strengthen our defense capability, guarding the peaceful labor of Soviet people and defending the cause of peace throughout the world.



Assessing the drafts of the plan and budget as a whole, one can say: They are in conformity with the directions of the 26th Party Congress and the subsequent plenums of the CPSU Central Committee. They embody fully enough all that is new and positive that has entered into the life of our country in recent years. I think the comrades will agree that we have every reason to approve the drafts of the plan and budget, and to recommend that the USSR Council of Ministers submit them for examination by a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The task of organizing precise and purposeful work on implementing all that has been outlined, is now moving to the fore. The question stands as follows: the plan must be fulfilled without fail, and wherever possible and necessary, overfulfilled. At the same time maximum efforts must be made to increase production efficiency. Of course one should ensure the smooth running of work and the strict observance of contractual obligations for deliveries of output. It should be said that it has been found possible to improve the situation here somewhat over the past 2 years. However, the task consists of attaining the complete fulfillment of contracts.

Understandably, each industry and enterprise has tasks and features of its own. There does, however, exist a common task which in our time should penetrate into the work of all industries and all enterprises: to manage better, make more efficient use of resources, to work with greater results; in other words, to manage the economy efficiently. What distinguishes the present day is that all work should be raised onto a qualitative higher level, that rationalization should encompass all the stages of the production process.

Care must be taken to create the essential economic and organizational conditions to develop the creative activeness of the masses. Workers and kolkhoz members, engineers and economists, scientists and economic managers will be able to apply their resources and knowledge to practical implementation of this task.

I would like to recall Vladimir I'lich Lenin's words that "raising the discipline of the working people, the workers' skills, the efficiency and the intensiveness of labor and better organization of work are conditions for economic advancement" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 188). We, Lenin said, addressing the working people, should calculate everything and everyone should learn to be thrifty.

The work of all working collectives, enterprises and industries should be organized in precisely this, and this only.

The saving of material resources is a wide area of activity. To be an assiduous manager, to struggle to attain the greatest possible savings--this is the foremost task. I would like to say that the approach to savings should now be fundamentally different. After all, how was it before? Savings were seen merely as some kind of supplement to the constantly growing and seemingly inexhaustible resources. Now the situation has changed substantially and we should no longer rely on constant increases in resources. In our time,

savings are precisely one of the most important sources of ensuring growth of production.

In 1985, the additional requirements of the national economy for fuel and energy resources and for rolled ferrous metals should be satisfied to the extent of almost 60 percent through savings in those areas. Stressed tasks have also been set in connection with saving other types of raw and other materials. It is quite clear from this that the planned targets can only be achieved if the norms of consumption envisaged are strictly observed. That is why ministries and production collectives must draw lessons from the errors of previous years, when targets for reducing material expenditure were frequently not met. At every enterprise, a precise plan for practical action to achieve economies must be worked out and strict control over its fulfillment must be instituted.

Naturally, the struggle for economics must permeate not only production, but also other spheres of our lives, including in the home. After all, one-fifth of our fuel and electricity is for home use and must be spent more thriftily.

You know, comrades, about the initiative by the best collectives of Moscow, the Ukraine and the Urals to create in each enterprise, oblast, kray and republic an above-plan savings fund. I think that this initiative is a useful one in keeping with the spirit of the times, and that it should be supported. Why, for example, should there not be an approach to this matter such that every labor collective, following the example of front-ranking enterprises, sets itself the task of working 2 days a year on the fuel, raw and other materials that have been saved?

This, incidentally, would provide stimulus for a specific and energetic search everywhere for ways of reducing the prime cost of output and cutting down various sorts of above-norm stocks and nonproductive expenditure. In brigades and workplaces this work would be supported by the introduction of personal economy accounts, and, of course, all these questions should be reflected in the socialist pledges of labor collectives.

The suggestion by Comrade V. V. Shcherbitskiy and other comrades to allocate the resources of this fund for social needs and, first and foremost, to improving medical services to the population, is worthy of approval.

Particular attention should be paid to the rational use of labor and to increasing its productivity. A profound analysis must be made of how workers are deployed, how efficient are their work methods and how each hour of working time is used. Something that meets this requirement well, for example, is the initiative by a number of labor collectives to provide qualification requirements for jobs at individual workplaces. It is very important for the workers themselves and for qualified engineering and technical staff to directly participate in this.

Providing formal job descriptions also includes the struggle for fuller use of production capacities, machinery and equipment. Over the years so far, an enormous potential has been accumulated in which the work of millions of Soviet people is embodied. And we cannot put up any longer with the fact that

in machine building, during the working day, 14 percent of all equipment is not working and that every third truck does not make runs. This is intolerable mismanagement, a waste of public labor. The situation must be objectively sorted out at every enterprise to attain better use of existing capacities.

As you know, the party Central Committee recently approved the experience of the Dnepropetrovsk Combine in formulating job descriptions and carrying out job rationalization. Ministries and local, party, soviet and trade union organs need to ensure the dissemination everywhere of this important initiative.

The next question: Rational management means constantly improving the quality of output. Everybody knows that the struggle for quality is inseparable from the conscientious fulfillment by every working person of the job entrusted to him.

The 1985 plan envisages important tasks for raising quality, but they should be considered as the minimum which has to be done.

We will be frank. Both in industry and other sectors, the situation as regards quality of output at the moment is not at its best. The quality of individual items of metal production causes criticism. The reliability of certain machinery and mechanisms is low. Chemists produce dull and nonresistant dyes. In construction, too, things are unfavorable. Brigade leaders of housing construction combines acted in a workmanlike and honest manner and out of conscience when they wrote a letter addressed to all construction workers in the country. They, as everybody remembers well, appealed for a decisive improvement in the quality of housing being handed over for use. It is not by chance that this letter received such a wide response and that the CPSU Central Committee adopted a special decision in support of it.

The sectorial ministries and central economic departments should work on improving quality on a reliable basis. Not one opportunity should be lost from sight, neither in the use of modern equipment and technology and the introduction of substantial awards for the development and mastery of new items of manufacture, nor in tangible reductions in prices for out-of-date products, raising the qualifications of cadres and many other things. The review of outdated standards and instructions, which provide no incentive for enterprises to improve their technical and economic output figures, must be speeded up.

It is quite clear that today the basis for effective development is the widespread introduction of the achievements of science and technology in production. A favorable assessment should be made of the draft plan's orientation toward creating and putting into production new types of machinery and equipment, toward increasing the scale of both the introduction of progressive technology and replacing old products with new ones.

However, if we look at the problem of the development of science and technology from broader positions, the state of affairs in this sphere arouses



some concern. Therefore, the Politburo deems it necessary to discuss at the forthcoming plenum of the CPSU Central Committee questions of speeding up scientific and technological progress and of improving its management in all links of the economy. The plenum should be prepared in such a way as to ensure that its decisions provide for a radical change in this vitally important direction of our development.

We must engage more energetically in improving management and the entire economic mechanism. A start has been made in this work with the experiment to expand the independence and responsibility of the enterprises of five ministries. In the coming year another 21 union and republican ministries will be included in this experiment. Consumer services enterprises in many oblasts will be changed over to the new conditions as well. Proposals are being prepared to improve the activity of construction organizations, to improve planning and estimating work and to raise the material interest of construction workers in the timely handing over of projects for use. New methods are being elaborated for efficient cooperation between sectors of the agroindustrial complex. The use of collective forms of organizing and paying for labor in the national economy is being expanded.

In a word, work to improve the management of the national economy is proceeding on a broad front. The effectiveness of this work will depend to a large extent on improving the style and methods of the activity of ministries and departments and all links of economic management. It appears to be useful to continue to simplify the management apparatus, to reduce excessive documentation and all forms of unnecessary paperwork.

Comrades, all of our efforts to speed up the development of the economy are, in the final analysis, directed toward having the opportunity to allocate more funds for social needs and raise the population's living standard more rapidly. As a matter of fact, it is toward this that our plans are directed. I would like to dwell only on one issue: the need for a decisive improvement in the provision of industrial goods and services for the population. The working people's incomes are rising year by year, which is natural for our society. But it is also natural that consumer demand is moving increasingly to high-quality goods--fashionable clothes and footwear, modern and reliable televisions and refrigerators and other technically advanced domestic goods.

It is precisely these high-quality goods that are in short supply. Industry was not prepared for this change in demand. It continues to produce an excess of goods of a relatively low consumer standard and not enough of the high-quality goods in increased demand. And so it turns out that, against a background of a general increase in the amount of goods, there is an excess of some types of products and a shortage of others.

What explanation can there be, other than gross errors, for the obvious shortage of good footwear, and particularly children's footwear, on sale in the shops? Can one say that things are in good order when the shelves of shoe stores are now crammed mainly with summer footwear? It is difficult to buy footwear appropriate to the season, and it is not rare for various goods, often those which are simple to produce and most essential in everyday life, simply to disappear from the shops. This indicates, in particular, that the

leaders of the USSR Ministry of Light Industry have been unable to ensure the necessary flexibility in studying and taking account of market requirements, and have not shown due concern for the reorganization of a number of important plants. This criticism can also be applied to many branches of machine building that produce consumer goods and also to trading organizations. It is precisely the trade sphere which should always and in all things provide a principled defense of the consumer's interests.

At the end of last year, the Politburo adopted a decision on elaborating a comprehensive program for the development of the production of consumer goods and consumer services. Our party line here is very clear. It is to ensure the accelerated development of all sectors and links of the economy, engaged in producing goods and providing services for the population. For this purpose, it is also necessary to refit them technically, to supply them with resources of raw and other materials and to intensify the extent to which employees have an interest in the quality and quantity of the goods that are being produced for the population. Comrade Aliyev, who heads the commission of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo responsible for guiding and checking the elaboration of the integrated program, has reported that work on the program is nearing completion and that it will very soon be submitted to the Politburo for examination.

Meanwhile, it is necessary at once to involve all ministries, enterprises and associations without exception in turning out goods and providing services for the population. Prime attention must be devoted to these matters, and use made of the extensive scope and rights accorded to local organs. We must manage our resources economically and more rapidly saturate the market with goods that are in short supply at present.

Comrades! The success of every great undertaking depends directly on the continuing enhancement of the level of party guidance of the economy, and on everything being done to step up party political work among the masses. Of the greatest importance here is the style of leadership and its ability to meet modern requirements.

It is necessary to provide a systematic analysis of the state of affairs in the economy of every region and of every enterprise; to carry out a skillful and continual search for optimum and resolution of tasks as they arise; to select cadres correctly; and to train them with much care and make strict demands upon them. The timeliness and soundness of all actions by party committees and soviet and economic organs, of all organizational and propaganda measures, must become an immutable law.

This is the approach, which, in many respects, characterizes the activities of the Central Committee of the Communist Parties of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Lithuania and Georgia, the Moscow Gorkom, and the Leningrad, Kaluga, Chelybinsk, Ulyanovsk and other party obkoms. It is entirely logical, therefore, that in these places the stable fulfillment of plans and tangible results in the intensification of production are being attained.

On the contrary, where the party committees are not fully asserting their organizing role, they are having a weakened effect on solving questions of the

development of production and satisfying the needs and demands of the population. This was shown, in particular, by discussion at the Central Committee Secretariat of the report from the Kalinin Party Obkom. Shortcomings of this sort must be resolutely corrected. We must root out inertia, formalism and declarativeness, wherever they appear.

Among the obligations and concerns of party committees, a most important place must be taken by the mobilization of labor collectives for the fulfillment to the letter of the plan for the final year of the five-year plan. Life has shown that the more clearly we explain to people our common problems and the tasks of every enterprise, every sector and every worker, the higher will be the production indices.

Relying on the primary party organization, we must direct the people's creative and labor initiative toward practical deeds. Full use should be made of the powerful level of socialist competition. Production results depend in no small measure on how it is organized in labor collectives, on what forms are selected and on how publicity in competition is ensured.

After all, it is no secret that apparently favorable general indicators often conceal a lagging behind at a large number of enterprises. Here is a typical example: Frontranking collectives of the Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry, overall, over 9 months of this year, reduced production costs against the plan by 117 million rubles. However, at the same time, at almost every fourth enterprise the planned level of expenditure was exceeded. For this reason, the ministry as a whole obtained savings less than half as great.

We must devote more attention to the so-called mid-field runners [serednyaki] as well--those who just manage to complete their plan but are in no hurry to join the frontrankers and do not wish to strain themselves. This is where our reserve lies, and it is no small reserve. What is more, we must take account of the fact that those who do not strive to improve their work today may swell the ranks of the laggards tomorrow.

In the struggle to fulfill plans, the development of competition, and the propagation of frontrank experience, we expect energetic activity from our trade unions and the Komsomol. They are called upon to develop worker initiative, to foster the adoption of counterplans and to seek to ensure that in every labor collective the best conditions for highly productive labor are created.

The vanguard role of communists should manifest itself to the full. It is a question, above all, of making every party member give a personal example of conscientiousness at work, of initiative and creativity, of good organization and discipline. But on its own this is not enough. Today, one of the most important criteria of party-mindedness is not only how a communist works and behaves, but also how resolutely and energetically he struggles against shortcomings and seeks a general improvement in the state of affairs.

The efforts of the mass media should be focused on key directions. What is needed now is to give assistance to the initiatives of innovators, to take

firm control of pledge fulfillment and to skillfully combine operational information, urgent signals, and constructive criticism, with the shining stores of everything positive, of the people of heroic labor.

In conclusion, allow me to express my confidence that the communists and working people will interpret the 1985 plan as a program of specific action and complete it successfully. We have every opportunity to complete the five-year plan in a fitting manner, and greet the 27th Congress of Lenin's party with high labor achievements.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/5

## CONSTANT ATTENTION AND SUPPORT FOR THE BRIGADES

AU140500 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84)  
pp 12-21

[Text] Three quarters of the five-year plan period have passed. It has been a period saturated with many important events in the life of the motherland and marked by shock work and new achievements in socialist competition. An important step has been taken along the path toward successfully fulfilling the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress. A sociopolitical atmosphere has been created in the country which is characterized by a collective, creative search for solutions to mature problems, efficiency and exactingness. The decisions of the February, April and October (1984) CPSU Central Committee plenums and of the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th Convocation are aimed at strengthening and developing this atmosphere. They are oriented toward coordinated, intensive work in all aspects of our construction. The brigade form of work organization has recently begun to acquire increasing significance. Comrade K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, highly appraised this long-term and extremely effective form of production cooperation at a meeting with workers from the Moscow Serp i Molot metallurgical plant.

"This form of organizing and stimulating work," he said, "was given a start in life at the initiative of progressive collectives. It was engendered in the very heart of the masses and is the result of the people's social creativity.

"An effective means, and one which is characteristic of our system, of increasing labor productivity has been developed. The correct method of combining the personal interests of the worker, the collective and society has been found. And this is one of the fundamental issues of socialist construction in both an economic, sociopolitical and educational respect.

"Such high political awareness and standard of work on the part of workers and kolkhoz members helps to form the essential elements of social relations under developed socialism."

At the end of last year the question of further introducing the brigade form into industry was examined at a session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and soon after this the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Further Developing and Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Brigade Form of

Organization and Stimulation of Labor in Industry" was published and also the resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Trade Union Council "On Measures To Further Develop and Enhance the Effectiveness of the Brigade Form of Organization and Stimulation of Labor" envisage a further increase in the working activeness of the masses, convincingly illustrate the ever increasing role of the brigades in accelerating the intensification of production and fulfilling the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and of subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums. In contemporary conditions the brigades are becoming the main production and social cell of the labor collectives. Basically, a fundamentally new, primary form of production management is coming into being and developing, and in connection with this noticeable transformations must take place and are already taking place throughout the whole system of planning, organizing production, labor and management.

At present the brigades include more than 60 percent of industrial workers and by the end of the five-year plan period this industrial index will reach approximately 68 percent and 70 percent in machine construction. At some enterprises the number of workers involved in brigade forms of labor organization has reached 85-90 percent. As is well known, even before the publication of the aforementioned documents, certain organizational measures had been adopted to facilitate the spreading of this form of labor organization. In recent years, and up to the present day, brigades have been formed and are being formed everywhere--in all branches of the national economy and in every region of the country and in both production and non-production spheres. Brigades of the new type--complex, integral process and economic accountability brigades--are developing and becoming increasingly widespread. Labor productivity grows more quickly in these brigades than in other primary cells of the collective, and worktime losses are reduced, additional resources are sought and a spirit of genuine collectivism, comradely mutual aid and mutual exactingness is established. It is in the activities of the brigades that the most important provisions of the USSR Law on Labor Collectives are most clearly manifest.

In the best brigades, where work is organized on a scientific basis, labor productivity increases at an average of 5-10 percent per annum. Brigades in the Uralmash (Sverdlovsk), Elektrosila (Leningrad), Kaluga Turbine Plant, Volga 50th Anniversary of the USSR Automobile Plant (Togliatti), Tatneft, Belorussian Automobile Plant, Raduga (Lvov) and Kupava Fine Cloth Plant production associations and others work very efficiently. Enterprises under the USSR Ministries of Power and Electrification, Power Machine Building, Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances, Electrical Equipment Industry, Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, Instrument Making, Automation Equipment and Control Systems, and Construction, Road and Municipal Machine Building have gained the greatest economic effect from the introduction of collective forms of organizing and stimulating labor.

As a rule, high indexes are reached where work in the brigades is organized on contemporary principles--on the basis of a unified system with remuneration calculated according to the final result and applying the coefficient of labor participation. Thus, in the machine tool and tool building industry there are

a considerable number of collectives where labor productivity has risen by 10-15 and even by 20 percent in a short period of time. Precisely this has been achieved by the brigades headed by V. Komarov, metal worker-fitter at the Moscow S. Ordzhonikidze Machine Tool Plant and Hero of Socialist Labor, V. Yermolayev, operator of machine tools with automatic numerical control at the Ivanov 50th Anniversary of the USSR Heavy Machine Tool Plant and laureate of the USSR State Prize, V. Miroshnichenko, tool-grinding machine operator at the Zaporozhye Voykov tool-building plant and many others. They achieved these successes primarily by means of making better use of worktime, ensuring that brigade members master two or more trades, conveying advanced experience to young people, strengthening labor discipline and increasing the responsibility and interest of every worker in achieving high final results.

Collective forms of organizing and remunerating labor also prove their numerous advantages no less convincingly in other branches of the national economy, for example, in transport. They have become considerably widespread, for example, at many automobile enterprises. Here the formation of brigades is accompanied, as a rule, by the introduction of contractual relations between brigades of automobile operators, the administration of motor transport establishments and the leadership of enterprises and organizations (dispatchers and recipients) serviced by automobile transport. The operators are collectively accountable to the administration of an automobile enterprise and to serviced organizations for the fulfillment of plan tasks relating to freight transportation according to a strictly established schedule and with the observance of set time limits for delivery and for model production and work discipline. Contract brigades are given greater economic independence in their choice of concrete ways and methods of organizing their work, improving the quality of transport services and reducing expenditure on transportations. The internal brigade economic accountability system is aimed at developing operators' initiative for the purposes of economizing outlays on wages, fuel and lubricating materials and also on automobile repairs, in every possible way. Collectives which have introduced the economic accountability system are more interested than others in fulfilling tasks on time and with high-quality and in efficiently utilizing labor, material and financial resources.

A very positive role is played by economic accountability brigades in construction. The many years' practice of the brigade contract according to the method of N. Zlobin, Moscow builder and Hero of Socialist Labor, has proven the extremely great economic effectiveness of his work methods. The educational role of work in these brigades is also great. The sharpened sense of being master of one's building site acts as a powerful stimulus in these brigades for achieving production successes. In these conditions every worker is oriented toward seeking reserves. In the opinion of many members of economic accountability brigades, the new work methods have made their lives more meaningful and their work more creative.

Complex economic accountability brigades now exert a tremendous influence upon the state of affairs in the country's capital construction. Labor productivity in these brigades is approximately one-third higher than in construction as a whole. Whereas in 1981 the prime costs of construction-assembly work were increased by 905.7 million rubles as opposed to the plan in



construction as a whole, 523 million rubles were economized by economic accountability brigades.

Whereas in construction organizations as a whole the specific proportion of workers' wage bonuses is approximately 9.2 percent and has increased by 0.7 percent in 5 years, in contract economic accountability brigades it has reached 16.7 percent.

The successful introduction of the brigade contract into construction is not only the result of initiative from below, but also of a great deal of organizational work on the part of "headquarters"--the construction ministries. Thus, the comprehensive long-term programs Podryad and Potok have been implemented for a number of years now within the system of the USSR Ministry of Industrial Construction. Coordinating councils have been set up in all the republican ministries, chief directorates and construction associations and directorates which come under the aforementioned ministry for the purpose of introducing the brigade contract. This has made it possible, for example, for the Ministry of Industrial Construction in the Belorussian SSR to fulfill more than 70 percent of the total volume of construction assembly work in the method of the brigade contract and to put nine out of every 10 construction units into operation with excellent and good appraisals. A great deal of positive experience in introducing the brigade contract has been accumulated by many organizations under the union Ministries of Construction of Heavy Industry Enterprises, Construction and Rural Construction.

Collective forms of production organization and labor remuneration have recently become increasingly widespread in agriculture. The positive experience accumulated, in particular, by contract subdivisions--brigades, teams and other collectives in Belgorod, Volgograd, Rostov, Saratov, Novosibirsk and Kalinin oblasts in the RSFSR, Nikolayev, Kherson and Donetsk oblasts in the Ukraine, Namangan, Surkhandarya and Samarkand oblasts in Uzbekistan, and also in some kolkhozes and sovkhoses in Kazakhstan, Turkmenia and other union republics is well known. Both labor achievements and the statistics of scientific institutions show that, in these collectives, in comparison to others, the yield of agricultural crops is 10-20 percent higher, labor productivity is 15-30 percent higher and production output per 100 rubles of production funds is 5-8 percent greater. Consequently, there is no branch of the economy where the brigades would not demonstrate their numerous advantages over other forms and methods of production and labor organization.

At the same time there are fundamental shortcomings in work to make the brigade form widespread. In a number of branches the formation of brigades bears the nature of a campaign and preference is frequently given to the quantitative side of things to the detriment of the qualitative. Brigades are sometimes formed without the necessary preliminary work requiring an improvement in internal plant planning, technology, organization of production and labor and the system by which it is remunerated. At many enterprises the responsibility of leading and engineering-technical workers in workshops, departments and services for creating the conditions for highly productive work by brigade members is not defined. The importance of explanatory work and the role of moral-psychological factors is frequently underestimated when



forming new primary labor collectives. The structure, forms and methods of work done by party, trade union and Komsomol organizations under the new conditions are slowly reorganized. The unity of ideological, organizational and economic activities is not ensured everywhere. All this reduces the great potentials of the collective organization of labor in increasing production efficiency.

Not all economic and party leaders have grasped that the formation of brigades in the workshops of plants, factories and associations does not signify the end, but only the beginning of introducing collective forms of work organization. The activities of departments dealing with labor and wages, supply and economic services, and bookkeepers and other plant administrative departments must be sharply improved in order to achieve precise work by the brigades and a steady improvement in its results.

In a word, the administration of enterprises and the organs of economic management are bound to conduct painstaking work to create the necessary conditions for highly productive work by all brigade members. It is also important to give the brigades and their councils help not only in production matters, but also in educational work, the strengthening of labor discipline, the resolving of problems connected with material and moral incentives and the organization of socialist competition. Practice shows that this is far from a simple matter. It is expedient to have a comprehensive plan at every enterprise for introducing and perfecting collective forms of organizing and stimulating labor. The management and the party and trade union committees are called upon to control systematically the fulfillment of all points in this document. It is primarily they who bear the responsibility for ensuring that this form of organizing and stimulating labor becomes the main one in the current five-year plan period.

The broad range of problems connected with making brigade forms of labor organization more widespread can be divided into two parts. These are perfecting the style and methods of work directly at brigade level, smoothing out the brigades' organizational forms and improving all work done in this direction, both on the scale of individual branches and the industry as a whole, that is, problems connected with implementing state leadership of this important matter.

What is most characteristic of the contemporary stage of development of collective forms of labor organization? Primarily the profound qualitative changes in the principles and methods of work of the collectives themselves.

For example, the strong tendency to increase the number of integral process brigades in comparison to shift brigades has been observed at the Leningrad Optical Instrument Association (LOIA), because, as experience has shown, worktime is better utilized in the former. Today more than 40 percent of the brigades here are integral process brigades. In sum total the brigades involve two-thirds of LOIA workers. Labor productivity in these brigades is, on average, 7-9 percent and even 15-20 percent in front-rank collectives, higher than that of individual workers. Counterplans and obligations for the brigades have become an important innovation which is now widespread in the association.

The system exists at the enterprise whereby remuneration based on the year's results is increased by 10-20 percent for those collectives which have adopted such a plan and fulfilled the annual plan tasks with an excess of no less than 8 percent.

Analogous processes are not only characteristic of individual enterprises, but also of major industrial regions. Thus, in Sverdlovsk Oblast at the beginning of the 10th Five-Year Plan Period complex brigades there could be counted on the fingers of one hand, as they say. Now there are approximately 19,000 of them, or 40 percent of the total number of primary labor collectives. For the purpose of increasing collective interest and responsibility many brigades are being transferred to the economic accountability system. They are set plan indexes for the use of equipment, raw and other materials, instruments, fuel and energy and the forms and scales of incentives to economize resources are determined for them. Nevertheless, there are still not so many such examples which can be cited. The number of economic accountability workers collectives in the total number of brigades in industry in the oblast at present does not exceed 8 percent. The situation is somewhat better in construction, where they comprise almost two-thirds of the total number.

The organization of competition both within the brigades and between them is daily perfected. Hundreds of workers' collectives have supported such patriotic initiatives as that of Moscow workers, "One percent more--one day earlier," Leningrad workers, "From high-quality work by each individual--to highly efficient work by the collective," Kharkov workers, "For high-quality work at every work place," and others. What is more, they have all been further developed and enriched with new experience. Thus, the complex brigade at the Zaporozhye Electric Locomotive Repair Plant, headed by A. Yemelyanov, has for 4 years now fulfilled its annual tasks 1 month ahead of time and it has more than 120 saved days to its credit since the beginning of the five-year plan period. For 4 years the collective has worked according to a unified system and has successfully applied the coefficient of work participation. There is a high level of interchangeability in this collective. It is characteristic that, having become complex, the brigade works much better.

Of course, high indexes are reached not only due to the initiative, energy, assiduity and high qualifications of brigade members. All these qualities become manifest only if there is skillful leadership on the part of the administration of the workshop, plant and association. The most interesting experience in this respect has been accumulated by those who earlier acted as initiators in the introduction of collective forms of work organization.

For example, organizational committees responsible for introducing brigade methods are set up at almost all enterprises, but they usually only operate in the initial period and then they hand over authority to the councils of brigade leaders. The Kaluga Turbine Plant Association has reached the conclusion that even a well-oiled brigade mechanism requires constant engineering-economic support. A bureau of brigade forms of work organization--a small subsection in terms of numbers--has been formed here and

has well shown its worth. It engages in analyzing the work of the brigades and drawing up recommendations to improve it.

Unfortunately, the formation of brigades does not always lead to radical improvements in the work of a workshop, plant, factory or association. This is so when an important matter is formally approached, without thorough economic preparation and detailed analysis, and sometimes also without desire where it is necessary to reorganize the entire system of brigade management of the collective.

The resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Trade Union Council on further developing and increasing the effectiveness of the brigade form of work organization envisages fundamentally broadening the rights of the primary labor collectives. That is why attempts to limit these rights and to establish petty guardianship of the brigades must be more resolutely opposed. But, alas, such cases are frequently come across. The Krasnodar Kray scientific-practical conference devoted to the brigade contract cited the following example. Leaders of a mobile mechanized column at Priazovrisstroy Trust No 9 frequently tried to show economic accountability brigades how to arrange technical equipment or how to carry out a technological operation. Under these conditions it is difficult to count on the manifestation of workers' initiative and socialist enterprise. Attempts to resolve all problems by administrative methods were also made by leaders of such Krasnodar enterprises and organizations as Stroymekhanizatsiya Trust No 2, Krasnodarstroy Trust SMU-13, and the Otradnensk Glavkrasnodaravtotrans enterprise. In these, and also in many other production collectives in the kray, newly formed brigades have had a very short lifespan and have broken up.

One cannot help but be alarmed by the fact that the number of economic accountability brigades, which, as a rule, achieve the most vital results in economizing labor, material and other resources, is growing only slowly. In those primary collectives engaged, for example, in mining work at various enterprises under the USSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy, labor productivity has risen by an average of 12 percent in 1 year. Similar examples can be cited from the practice of many branches, although of the total number of brigades in industry only 14.7 percent are economic accountability brigades, and at enterprises under the USSR Ministry of the Meat and Dairy Industry they comprise less than 2 percent. This is explained by the fact that brigades are not everywhere supplied with everything necessary for highly productive labor and the collectives themselves do not always have allotted resources at their disposal. Another reason is the weak normative base. Where there are no scientifically substantiated norms for the expenditure of labor and material and energy resources, it is difficult, and sometimes even impossible, to determine their real saving. The creation of such norms must become a subject of particular concern for ministries and departments: if this task is not fulfilled the brigade economic accountability system cannot be introduced.

A standard provision on the production brigade, the brigade leader, the brigade council, and the brigade leader council grants the primary production collective extensive rights in resolving problems connected with increasing the professional skill of the workers. This has found reflection both in the

USSR Law on Labor Collectives and in their enhanced role in managing enterprises, institutions and organizations, and has also been confirmed in the aforementioned decisions regarding the problems of increasing the effectiveness of collective forms of work organization. It is extremely important that these rights should not remain on paper, but find concrete expression in the daily activities of the brigades. The passivity of labor collectives is an extremely alarming symptom which testifies to the unsatisfactory nature of political-educational work at the enterprise or in the workshop and to the inability of economic and party leaders to arouse the initiative of the masses and channel it into resolving vital matters connected with perfecting management and increasing production efficiency.

The working and social activeness of the cause depend to a large extent on the personal and practical qualities of the brigade leader. His role in contemporary conditions is also determined by the increased complexity of technical equipment and by complicated production interdependences. Today a brief break in the work of just one production brigade can sometimes upset the normal work of a whole chain of cooperating enterprises, if not several branches. Consequently, particular attention must be paid to selecting and training brigade leaders and to increasing their professional skill and raising the level of their economic and political knowledge. The point has already been raised on more than one occasion in the press and at various representative meetings and conferences that in a number of cases engineers and technicians can and must lead brigades and also act as advisers in these brigades in the fulfillment of specific engineering tasks. Now, wherever this is dictated by the interests of production, it is recommended drawing engineering-technical workers and production organizers into complex brigades. However, it is important to ensure that specialists drawn into brigades are utilized for their direct purpose so that they can fully apply the knowledge they have received at higher education establishments.

Improving the quality of brigade work and increasing the number of brigades will doubtless be helped by measures aimed at perfecting the material stimulation of brigade leaders and all members of these collectives. In particular, there are provisions for additional payments under certain conditions for brigade leaders, team leaders, section foremen and also for specialists, directly involved in introducing brigade forms and resolving problems connected with increasing workers' labor productivity. And it is especially important that production brigades in industry which are on piece-rate wages be granted the right to increase the additional payment of apprentices showing assiduity and skill and making a concrete contribution to the general cause above that required by regulations in force. This measure will assist the training of young cadres for the brigades. In addition, it will help novices to more quickly familiarize themselves in the brigades and to feel they are full members of the factory family. However, not only the labor collectives themselves, party and trade union committees in the provinces, and engineering-economic service workers, but also ministries and departments and the planning organs must expend a considerable amount of effort for these rights to be more rapidly and fully exercised in practice.

In accordance with the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Further Developing and Increasing the Effectiveness of the Brigade Form of

Organization and Stimulation of Labor in Industry," the central organs of economic management and the leaders of associations and enterprises and party and trade union organizations are bound to have a detailed understanding of the existing situation and to adopt every measure to systematically develop this form of work organization and increase its effectiveness. This task is all the more relevant in view of the fact that simple statistical analysis frequently fails to provide a sufficiently full picture. Revealing the real effect of introducing collective forms of work organization is possible only if one has carefully studied and compared a very broad range of indexes in the light of dynamic development over a number of years.

Given the relatively satisfactory state of affairs with the introduction of the brigade economic accountability system in capital construction, numerous cases of failure to observe contracts between subcontracting collectives in the branch draw attention to themselves. Thus, in 1981 14.6 percent of concluded contracts were broken, and in organizations under the Ministry of Construction in the Far East and Transbaykal Regions virtually every third contract was broken. Analysis of the results of the activities of almost 1,500 economic accountability brigades has shown that more than one-third of contracts concluded with primary labor collectives are not fulfilled due to late and incomplete material-technical supplies, which leads to delays and the breaking of schedules. The working rhythm of the brigades is also broken because of unsatisfactory supplies of small-scale mechanization means instruments and equipment. According to the statistics of ministries and departments, construction organizations' requirements for certain types of mechanized instruments and construction-finishing machines are only satisfied by 10-20 percent. The fact that more than 40 percent of projects are built without extremely important documents--production plans--while those documents that do exist frequently contain considerable deficiencies, also prevents things from being precisely organized. Finally, many contract brigades do not have plans and schedules for work on different projects throughout the year, which makes it impossible for them to efficiently distribute their resources and organize their work precisely.

These shortcomings are basically also characteristic of brigades in industry. It is not normal that a large number of them do not have set plan tasks in physical indexes. At a number of machine construction enterprises the brigades have no monthly production list plans and consequently they have no clear perspective and are deprived of the opportunity to make good preparations for the fulfillment of tasks. Plans are frequently drawn up on a purely formal basis and that is why they are often amended.

Cases such as these, of course, are totally inadmissible. Every brigade should have a precise annual plan, as far as possible, which is "broken up" into monthly schedules. It would possibly make sense to apply the principles of the well-known "Orlov continuous work method"--sliding plans and schedules, in accordance with which a collective is given an absolutely exact plan for the coming month and an approximate plan with calculated indexes as close as possible to real indexes for the month after--when planning the work of the brigades. It must be remembered while implementing strict control that brigade plans must well take into account the individual capabilities and qualifications of the workers in the brigades, and, while drawing up these

plans, the abilities of the collective members should not be leveled, but helped to reveal themselves more fully.

In addition, the introduction of brigade forms of work organization requires a rise in the level of planning work within the framework of the entire enterprise, and also a sharp improvement in the engineering preparation of production. It is no accident that where the brigade form of work organization has become the main one, in a number of cases special schedules for the dispatching of batches of component parts and semi-finished products from workshop to workshop have to be introduced and the calendar planning of production operations tightened up, in addition to the usual planning and technical documentation.

Finally (and this is totally obvious), the fulfillment of long-term plans for introducing brigade forms of work organization requires increased attention to the problems of developing the production of means for mechanizing labor, various manual instruments and transport lifting mechanisms. The brigades will only be able to show their abilities to the full if they are sufficiently supplied with technical equipment of this kind, which facilitates and rationalizes work. And far from all such machines and assembly units can be built with the resources of enterprises which have adopted collective forms of work organization.

Introducing the brigade form of work organization is an important sector of ministry activity. This work requires a definite system, constant control and the participation of branch leaders. This matter has been well arranged, for example, in the Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry. The ministry's permanent commission engages in the operative leadership, planning and control of the introduction of collective forms of organizing and stimulating labor. The leaders of the chief committees and production associations and enterprises are personally responsible for reorganizing the methods of economic operations. Functional subsections are given concrete tasks for perfecting the management of economic accountability brigades.

Control over the progress of introducing the brigade form of work organization is implemented through the main computing center according to unified forms of operational accountability. Special-purpose checks are periodically carried out. Their results are examined at meetings of the branch permanent commission, which is led by the deputy minister and also at sessions of the ministry collegium. The functions of the head organization for the normative-methodological ensuring of the development of the brigade form of work organization are fulfilled by the branch center of the scientific Organization of Labor. Branch institutions also participate in this. Since 1979 requirements pertaining to the introduction of brigade forms have been compulsorily taken into account when developing new technological processes and drawing up projects for reconstructing enterprises, workshops and sectors.

Finally, cadres in the branch are trained in the methodological fundamentals of planning work and management in the conditions of brigade organization with wages calculated on final results. Leading workers and specialists study according to a special program drawn up by the branch institute for raising qualifications. The programs are developed while taking into account the



experience of the Kaluga Turbine Plant---a progressive enterprise well-known in the country as an initiator of brigade forms and other new work methods. Leaders and specialists at a number of associations and enterprises have also undergone this kind of training. Group seminars are held for leading workers in the main functional departments and services (chief technicians and the heads of production departments and departments for work organization and wages). Particular attention is devoted in the branch to training brigade leaders and their reserve; there is a special program for this purpose.

However, the forms of training are not sufficiently effective everywhere. The USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems is primarily called upon to state its views on this matter. The publication of academic and information-methodological literature for brigade leaders should be increased and not only by the central and branch publishing houses, but also by the local ones elucidating practice in the provinces. Particular attention must be paid to the intelligibility of published materials. For example, some of them can be in the form of questions and answers. More literature must be published on the experience of progressive brigades revealing by what means they achieve high results in their work and which methods they use.

A great deal will have to be done in the immediate future for introducing collective work forms. In a number of branches seminar-conferences are held by brigade leaders with the participation of party, trade union and Komsomol workers. Tasks connected with further developing collective forms of work organization are discussed in detail at these meetings. A large role in propagandizing achievements in this sphere is played by the USSR Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy.

Introducing collective forms of organizing and stimulating labor is an important sector of activity of the party organizations. It is their duty to raise the level of organizational and ideological-educational work in the lower labor collectives. It is important to increase party influence in the brigades, form party groups where conditions permit and direct their activities toward establishing a healthy moral-psychological climate, developing labor and social activeness and cultivating a strong sense of responsibility in members of the collective for fulfilling plan tasks and socialist obligations.

The resolution on this issue, which was adopted in December last year, envisages forming commissions within the primary party organizations of enterprises responsible for controlling the activities of the administration in introducing the brigade work form and improving its efficiency.

The CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Further Developing and Increasing the Effectiveness of the Brigade Form of Organizing and Stimulating Labor in Industry" and also the resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Trade Union Council are clear and convincing evidence of the determination of the party and the government to firmly and consistently pursue a policy to intensify production and increase the labor activeness of the masses. Implementing the measures outlined in these documents will help to accelerate the rates of economic development and to further improve the well-being of the people. It will be an important contribution to fulfillment

of the task set by Comrade K. U. Chernenko: "...to raise all work to a qualitatively higher level and rationalize all units in the production process."

The brigade form of work organization is a powerful lever in the development of our economy and in the speeding up of the rates of socialist and communist construction. And every potential inherent in this form of work organization must be used to the greatest effect and placed at the service of the five-year plan.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/5



K. U. CHERNENKO'S SPEECH AT THE MEETING WITH LEADERS OF SOCIALIST YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS OF SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

LD051143 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 1984) pp 22-25

[Text] "Dear Friends:

I would like to begin by cordially greeting you on behalf of the Central Committee of our party and the Central Committee Politburo.

Such a representative meeting of leaders of youth organizations from socialist countries is truly heartening because it is a graphic manifestation of those firm, unbreakable bonds of friendship and cooperation which exist between our parties, states and peoples. It is heartening because contacts between young people and their organizations at different levels constitute tangible preconditions for those bonds to grow in strength and number.

Improvement of the guidance of youth organizations is one of the primary concerns of the communists. This was forcefully demonstrated anew by a meeting of secretaries of the central committees of the fraternal parties in Sofia last summer, which was devoted to work among young people. As you know, the CPSU Central Committee recently approved a major decree--a program resolution, I would say--intended to enhance party leadership of the Komsomol. That decree has been discussed in all the party and Komsomol organizations of the country and practical measures have been taken everywhere with a view to fulfilling it.

I would like to stress most definitely that the adoption of that decree was not caused by some "crisis phenomena" among young people, as our opponents try to make out. We have every reason to take pride in the Leninist Komsomol and in Soviet youth in general. Young people give a good account of themselves everywhere, in work, in studies and in military service alike. Young people carry on with honor the cause of the older generation and, responding to the call of the party, boldly set about tackling tasks of major importance to the country.

You undoubtedly know what the Baykal-Amur Mainline is and in what exceptionally difficult physical conditions it is being built. The contribution of Soviet youth to opening end-to-end commercial traffic on that

railroad a whole year ahead of schedule was truly invaluable. I am convinced that young people will contribute effectively to the fulfillment of the unprecedented land reclamation program which was adopted at the recent October 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

Giving the Komsomol and young people in general their due for their services, we also clearly see that the objective needs of the development of Soviet society raise new problems in work among young people. We are fully aware of their political importance.

Undoubtedly, the rising generations today are incomparably closer to the inspiring goals for the accomplishment of which their fathers and grandfathers began to struggle. They see them with greater clarity from the vantage point of the historical achievements of real socialism and are heading for them on the straight path of creative work. All this is really so. But new society and therefore young people today face tasks which are, perhaps, no less grandiose in scope than those during the revolution or the period of transition. What is on the agenda is the full realization of the immense superiority of socialism. What is on the agenda is the bringing of every aspect of the life of our society in accord with the highest demands of scientific socialism and therefore the removal from it of everything which is incompatible with socialist justice, collectivist principles and work morality.

All this actually constitutes the essence of the course of perfecting developed socialism. Its comprehensive substantiation is to be supplied by a new edition of the CPSU Program, which is to be adopted at the next, 27th Party Congress. And, as I already had occasion to point out, the services of the present generation of Soviet people and, of course, Komsomol members and young people to the homeland will be measured first and foremost by how successfully we accomplish the task of perfecting the socialism we have built.

So you see what responsibility is put on our replacement, on those who are to develop everything into which the initiators of socialist construction put their revolutionary enthusiasm and elan. We have no right to fail here. That is why party organizations are constantly analyzing processes taking place among young people and concern themselves in practice with molding young citizens of the land of the soviets.

Correct and truly effective education of young people can only be achieved when all of them participate in the most active manner in the common work of the people. Today we are tackling such innovative tasks as the intensification of the national economy, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the fulfillment of the Food and Energy programs. We attach priority importance also to the further development of socialist democracy and to the ever broader participation of the mass of the population in the administration of public and state affairs. The party and Komsomol bodies have a good deal to do to find ways which will ensure the most effective application of the forces, initiative and energy of young people.

We want the Komsomol's say in the solution of all questions, both those bearing on the work, everyday life and recreation of young men and women and

those constituting problems of nationwide importance, problems of importance to the whole people.

The party, true to Leninist traditions, approaches our young people, the Komsomol, with profound attention and trust, and regards them as a boundless reserve of cadres. I want to point out in this context the great importance of the resolution on cadre policy approved recently by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. It stresses specifically the need for young promising workers to work side by side with veteran members of the older generation and to acquire essential training.

The Komsomol has today heretofore unprecedented possibilities for the ideological, political and moral education of young men and women. It is necessary to make useful these possibilities. We cannot help taking account in this matter of massive psychological warfare unleashed by the imperialist forces against socialist countries. That is why we orient the Komsomol to energetic, purposeful and thoughtful work in educating young people in the spirit of commitment to communist convictions, lofty moral principles and boundless devotion to the homeland and to the great cause of socialism.

Success in this work, as, I should say, in any other work with people, depends to an immense extent on the very style of the activity of the Komsomol. We orient it to the resolute eradication of formalism, red tape, overorganization and pomp. Indeed, the strength of Komsomol lies in its being a truly democratic, self-governed organization of young people.

We understand, of course, that some important problems of young people, particularly socioeconomic problems, are too complex for the Komsomol to resolve single-handed. However, it is here, in this sphere, that the foundations of organizational, educational and cultural work are being laid. The CPSU Central Committee demands from the party, government, trade union and economic bodies constantly to concern themselves with the education and training of younger generations and with improving working, housing and living conditions for them, and timely to resolve relevant problems.

There is one more point, comrades. Reality today is such that the peoples of our countries have to fulfill the creative tasks of building socialism in an exceptionally complex international situation. Life on earth itself is in jeopardy.

I would like again to stress most definitely that a course of arms buildup, confrontation and incitement of conflicts is not our policy. And if the world situation causes alarm, responsibility for this is borne fully and entirely by the imperialist reactionary forces led by the United States. It is precisely it and its allies that have set themselves the insane goal of achieving military superiority over socialist states. Naturally, we cannot allow this to happen. And we shall never allow it. The CPSU and the Soviet state are consistently pursuing the Leninist policy of peace and cooperation. We are working perseveringly together with the fraternal countries further to strengthen the international positions of the socialist community and to organize a befitting rebuff to any aggressive plans.

Our party highly appreciates the contribution of youth organizations of socialist countries to efforts for peace and against the threat of nuclear war. We support all the initiatives of the Komsomol aimed to accomplish that noble task. I know that you discussed at your meeting preparations for the 12th World Festival of Youth and Students in Moscow. The festival movement has been tested by practice and its importance to the cause of peace and understanding among nations is quite great. Naturally, the Central Committee of our party and the Soviet government will give every help to the Komsomol in holding the festival so that it should really become a mass-scale and impressive antiwar and anti-imperialist event for young people of the entire world.

I would like to wish you, comrades, to strengthen even more perseveringly contacts with progressive and democratic youth organizations on all continents of the world. This will undoubtedly contribute to the further strengthening of the anti-imperialist cohesion among detachments of the international youth movement and to the broadening of the ranks of champions of peace and social progress.

It is very good that you exchanged information about the organizational ideological work of youth organizations in your respective countries in connection with the 40th anniversary of victory over German fascism and Japanese militarism. The celebrations of this remarkable anniversary offer broad possibilities for the popularization of the foreign policy of peace pursued by the countries of the socialist community and, of course, for the demonstration of the indubitable achievements of real socialism.

I would like to ask you, dear friends, to convey upon returning home heartfelt greetings and the best wishes from the CPSU Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee Politburo to the general and first secretaries of the central committees of the fraternal parties of your countries.

Allow me to wish you, comrades, every success in your work. Be good friends, be more bold and energetic in your actions and work perseveringly to ensure that the youth organizations of our countries always are dependable helpers of the communist parties in everything. We count on this.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/5

ADDRESS BY K. U. CHERNENKO TO U.S. READERS

PM121314 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press Nov 21 1984) pp 25-26

[From the book "Soviet-American Relations: Articles and Speeches by K. U. Chernenko," published by the American Publishing House Praeger]

[Text] Esteemed readers:

I hope this book will in some measure help you to understand better how the Soviet Union sees the world, what it is striving for and what it advocates. I think that a collection of speeches and articles delivered and written at various times and on various occasions is the best way to achieve this, since its contents reflect real moments of history in progress; they contain assessments of various events that were made at the time, and not in retrospect.

I think the reader will notice that the subject of Soviet-American relations from one point of view or another, is present in practically all of my statements. That is not surprising since it is our two countries that bear a particular responsibility for ensuring peace on earth, and for people in all countries to be able to live and work in peace.

It is not a question of anyone's subjective desire to assume or not to assume that responsibility. Rather, it is what history has decreed. Hence our attention, and, I would add, our balanced approach to all that determines the state of relations between our countries and all that can help to improve them.

We have difficulty in understanding the logic of those who say that the continuing tension in relations with the USSR is something unavoidable--fatally predetermined, almost--and that the United States has nothing to lose by it.

In your country there are also people who claim that in general, they are not opposed to normal relations with the Soviet Union, and that they are for talks with the USSR and even for agreements in the sphere of arms limitation. But to achieve this, they say, the United States must be stronger than the USSR. This, of course, is not so. The desire to achieve military superiority and

the holding of honest and businesslike talks on issues concerning both sides' natural security are incompatible things. The unrestrained buildup of the arms race and its spread even into space is, in the final analysis, a threat to the United States' own security.

Attempts to achieve military superiority are both untenable and dangerous, and of course cannot but complicate our relations. Conversely, when both sides were showing readiness to adhere to the principle of equality and equal security, and on that basis arrived at mutually acceptable understandings, including on the issue of arms limitation, then there was also a change in atmosphere in the relations between our countries. It was a change for the better.

There is no other prospect but living side by side. Therefore, it is better to live not in an atmosphere of hostility and fear, but in peace, humanely, observing certain norms in our interrelations.

I hope that when the American reader gets to know our country's approach to the questions of war and peace and our concrete proposals, he will become convinced that the Soviet Union stands for equal and, if possible, good relations with your country, and desires accord with the United States on a broad spectrum of issues.

All we ask is that our proposals be judged objectively, without prejudice. Prejudice and lack of desire to know the truth have never done any good, and today they could have the gravest consequences.

I wish readers of this book in the United States prosperity and peace.

K. Chernenko

COPYRIGHT; Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/5

K. U. CHERNENKO'S ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FROM M. KALB, CORRESPONDENT OF THE  
AMERICAN TELEVISION COMPANY NBC

PM172057 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84)  
pp 26-28

[PRAVDA, 18 November 1984]

[Text] Question: What do you believe should be the first order of business in Soviet-American relations, specifically following the reelection of President Reagan?

Answer: The task is not to establish some sort of a formal scale of priorities, not to arrange a sequence of issues depending on particular events. Of course there are many problems in the world, but life itself, the development of the international situation in recent years, has brought to the fore the kind of questions which, if not resolved through joint effort, may turn into a great calamity both for the United States and the Soviet Union, as well as for all mankind.

I have in mind the problem which, one may say, overshadows all others: how to avert the threat of a nuclear war, to find ways to stop the arms race and to bring about such a situation in the world whereby peoples would have no fear for tomorrow. In this endeavor no delay is admissible.

In some Western capitals a dangerous stereotyped fallacy is being put forward that the piling up of mountains of weapons can ensure someone's security. This did not stand to reason in the past, and in a nuclear age it has become totally untenable and absurd.

All of us live on the same planet or, as they say, in one common home. One must take care that there should be the least possible amount of explosives in our home.

It is this--the limitation and reduction of arms, and above all nuclear arms and prevention of the spread of the arms race into areas that have so far been free of that race--that the USSR and the United States should agree on in the first place.

For our part we are prepared to work, and to work vigorously, precisely toward that end. Moreover, we have proposed practical, I emphasize, practical ways to achieve this objective.

I already mentioned some of them in my recent interview with THE WASHINGTON POST, namely, concluding an agreement on the prevention of militarization of outer space, a quantitative and qualitative freeze on nuclear weapons and completing the work on an agreement providing for a complete and general ban on nuclear weapon tests.

The list of possible steps aimed at the strengthening stability and security can, certainly, be made longer. I mentioned the urgent and, in our view, objectively most easily solvable issues.

If the statements being made lately in Washington regarding the desire to seek solutions to problems of arms limitation do not remain just words, we could, at last, start moving toward more normal relations between our two countries and toward a more secure world. To put it briefly, what is required is that the United States join us in the search for practical solutions to concrete problems.

Question: Would you agree to meet with President Reagan for a discussion of Soviet-American relations within 6 months following the start of his second term on January 20, 1985?

Answer: I have already had occasion to express quite definitely the opinion that personal contacts between leaders of states are important.

In fact, this is confirmed by the experience of Soviet-American relations. A summit meeting could provide a powerful impetus for the constructive development of mutual relations if such a meeting can result in achieving major, clearly defined goals.

Can it be said that the necessary conditions have now taken shape so that a Soviet-American summit meeting might yield the expected results? Frankly, I do not think so.

When there is confidence that a summit meeting could yield success and positive results, then it will not be difficult to set a date for holding such a meeting.

Question: Do you believe that detente, as it was practiced during the 1970s, can ever return to Soviet-American relations as a guiding framework? Or, is a new framework necessary and, if so, what might it be?

Answer: I would put it this way. It was precisely in the 1970s that it became possible, through the joint effort of our two countries, to achieve for the first time a major breakthrough on the way to solving what prior to then had seemed an impossible task: limiting and reducing nuclear arms. It was at that time that the United States and the USSR interacted fairly well in solving certain international problems. All this taken together had a most positive effect on the world situation as a whole.



A great deal was also accomplished in the area of Soviet-American bilateral relations as such, to the benefit of both sides. The result was a considerable increase in the degree of mutual trust.

What was it that made it possible to take those steps, steps that largely made the relaxation of international tensions possible--a characteristic feature of the 1970s? The main thing was the realization that the arms race could not ensure security for either side and, also, that both sides were actually willing to build relations on the basis of equality with due consideration for the legitimate interests of each other and without prejudice to the interests of third countries.

We are convinced that there can be no other rational basis for relations between the USSR and the United States if one is to look not to confrontation but to peaceful coexistence. If both sides proceed consistently on this basis, and the Soviet Union does precisely that, then a constructive development of Soviet-American relations will be ensured. These relations must become an important positive factor in the world situation. I say this while bearing in mind the special responsibility of our countries for the preservation of peace.

That kind of relationship between our countries would open, among other things, broad potential for cooperation between the USSR and the United States in solving global problems of concern to all mankind, such as, for example, the famine relief effort in some areas of the world and protection of the environment.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPPS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/5

## THE REAL DEMOCRACY OF SOVIET SOCIETY

AU120601 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84)  
pp 29-43

[Article by V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee]

[Text] The experience of socialist and communist construction in our country and in the fraternal countries of the socialist community convincingly confirms the historical correctness and vitality of the Leninist thesis that "victorious socialism is impossible without the implementation of full democracy" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 27, p 253). The party regards the steady development and deepening of socialist democracy as an objective requirement of social practice in the conditions of perfecting developed socialism and as one of the most important prerequisites of society's progress along the path toward communism. Comrade K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, has emphasized that the new wording of the CPSU Program "must make particular reference to the state, the forms of the people's socialist self-government, and the deepening and consistent development of our system's real democracy in all spheres of social life."

The 26th CPSU Congress has made an important contribution to the theory and practice of socialist democracy. Having comprehensively analyzed the activities of the most important institutions of democracy, the congress set new tasks for perfecting the democratic foundations of developed socialist society. A broad complex of concrete measures called upon to increase the effectiveness of the means, forms and methods of implementing Soviet democracy in practice has been outlined by subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums. The decisions of the April 1984 Central Committee Plenum and the theses contained in the speech given by Comrade K. U. Chernenko at that plenum have great significance for increasing the effectiveness of democracy and for more fully utilizing those reserves of activating the masses that are inherent in the further perfection of Soviet society's political system.

Fulfillment of the tasks set by the 26th CPSU Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums not only requires new, more intensive effort on the part of party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations and labor collectives in political, organizational and ideological-educational spheres of activity, but

also the intensified theoretical analysis of the problems of further developing democracy as a law of perfecting socialist social relations.

Socialist democracy is an extremely comprehensive concept. It expresses the very essence of true democracy, the form of the socialist state, the principles upon which the organization of social life is built, the nature of civic rights and freedoms and the methods by which these rights and freedoms are exercised. By its very nature and the methods by which it is implemented, socialist democracy is a real, consistent, effective and all-embracing democracy. It is a "working" democracy.

In the conditions of mature socialism, its facets, features and component parts develop, are enriched and interact, while acting as a powerful factor in social progress when taken as a whole.

The development of democracy takes place in all spheres of society's vital activity and in every link of the state and social mechanism. The range of political, economic, social and educational actions called upon to ensure this development is broad--from passing a state law to discussing a concrete proposal aimed at improving the organization of the work of a production unit, brigade or sector. This process, like the perfecting of developed socialism as a whole, is of a purposeful and systematic nature.

The policies of the Marxist-Leninist party express the vital needs, interests and will of the millions of working masses. The clause in the USSR Constitution which states that the further development of socialist democracy is a vital aspect of the development of Soviet society's political system reflects one of the most important aspects of the connection between policy and democracy. Society's political system in relation to democracy acts as a mechanism for implementing this democracy and as a complex of means ensuring its effective functioning and perfection. In its turn, the implementation of socialist democracy means bringing politics within the reach of the millions that make up the masses of the population. Serious politics, V. I. Lenin emphasized, begins where the millions act ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 36, pp 16-7).

Armed with Marxist-Leninist theory, the CPSU guides the development of Soviet society, leads it and is the political leader of the people. It is precisely the Marxist-Leninist party that ensures the correct combination of the interests of the various classes and strata of the population by giving priority to national interests and overcoming any narrow, departmental and parochial manifestations. It acts as both a comprehensive guarantor and political bearer of the principles of socialist democracy, and also as the organizer of their implementation. This finds concrete expression in the party's leadership of the processes connected with strengthening and developing the political system of socialist society, consolidating the legal basis of state and social life, perfecting the state and economic mechanism, increasing the activeness of the working people and enhancing the role of social organizations, strengthening the people's control, extending publicity in social and state matters and studying and considering public opinion.

The further development of our political system and the perfection of socialist democracy rely, as is well-known, on a number of fundamental party and state decisions. The USSR Constitution is their legislative base and exerts great influence on the whole of Soviet social life and on the strengthening of democracy, legality and law and order. The April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum provided fresh social impulse for more effective participation by the working people in management, a real broadening of the forms of this participation, and its development and intensification. The plenum decisions are primarily aimed directly at activating the work of the soviets so that these mass organs of state authority exercise all their constitutional powers to the full. This task is no less relevant to the trade unions, the Komsomol, the labor collectives and the organs of people's control. "As a whole," Comrade K. U. Chernenko has noted, "it is a question of developing the creative strength of the people's socialist self-government to its full extent. In this lies the meaning of perfecting our society's political system. This also brings our political system closer to the ideal of socialism."

While guiding the political development of Soviet society, the CPSU sets an example of implementing the principles of democracy in the practice of its internal life. As is well-known, democratic centralism is the main, fundamental principle of party formation and activity. Collectively in the work of the party organs, the development of criticism and self-criticism, and so forth are implemented on its basis.

Modified in conformity with the particular features of a given sphere of society, the principles of democratic centralism are embodied in the organization of social life on a country-wide scale.

Socialist democracy operates and develops on a firm economic foundation--on the basis of socialist production relations and primarily of socialist ownership of the means of production. Lenin wrote: "Any democracy, like any political superstructure in general (this superstructure being inevitable until classes have been eliminated and a classless society created), ultimately serves production and is ultimately determined by the production relations of a given society" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 42, p 276).

The economic policies of the Communist Party and the Soviet state are naturally of a democratic nature as well. The highest objective of these policies, which are aimed at perfecting the relations of production, distribution and exchange, is to improve the people's well-being. The management of socialist production is of the same nature. The fact that it has its own particular features (for example, the operation of the principle of one-man management and the limiting of the sphere of electivity of officials) does not change the essence of the matter.

As a result of systematically developing socialist production, the material basis and economic levers of the functioning of democracy and its institutions, including the mass information media, are being strengthened and the practical possibilities for fulfilling democratic civil rights to an increasing extent, such as the right to work, rest, health care, old-age

pension, living accommodation and access to the achievements of culture, and so forth, are being expanded.

In the process of perfecting developed socialism, the social basis for further developing democracy--the alliance of the workers, the peasantry and the intelligentsia--is strengthened, society's social homogeneity is intensified and the essential socioeconomic and cultural differences between people engaged in physical labor and those engaged in intellectual work are erased. All this attests to the fact that it is within the historical framework of developed socialism--in the main and in the basic [v osnovnom]--that society's classless structure will take shape. The workers class is the decisive social force in this process.

The formation of society's social homogeneity organically includes the flourishing and drawing together of socialist nations. The practice of socialist construction has confirmed the great scientific prediction of K. Marx and F. Engels: "Hostile relations between nations will disappear at the same time as antagonism between classes within nations" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 4, p 445). Class and national antagonisms have been eliminated once and for all in our country in the course of socialist transformations, and the general national economy complex and the moral-political unity and friendship of the peoples of the USSR have been established and consolidated. The social role of a factor such as the multinational nature of the Soviet Union has fundamentally changed. From being a source of weakness in the past, it has become a factor enhancing the strength of the socialist state.

The national problem, as it was left us by an exploitative system, has been definitively and irrevocably resolved. It is also important to stress that it has been resolved by democratic means. The free self-determination of nations and the voluntary unification of equal Soviet socialist republics into one union state have opened up the broadest possible scope for the comprehensive progress of the peoples of our country.

There is no doubt that the closest possible link exists between the process of drawing nations and nationalities closer together and the process of deepening socialist democracy.

Improving the distribution of productive forces within the framework of a multinational country, stimulating the growth of the national detachments of the workers class, ensuring the proper representation of the working people of all nations and nationalities in party, state and social organs, and combining state and republic principles in the development of statehood--all this represents both the manifestation in practice of the effectiveness of socialist democracy and a condition of its further development.

It is characteristic that the principles of proletarian internationalism and socialist democracy are also mutually interwoven in the fulfillment of an important task such as that of struggling against various nationalist prejudices, national narrow-mindedness, parochialism and hypertrophied or distorted manifestations of national sentiments.

The ideological and spiritual prerequisites for deepening Soviet democracy are strengthened in the process of perfecting mature socialism. The party guides the development of socialist culture and the process of forming the new man. The comprehensive spiritual enrichment of the individual is an original "point of contact" of the main directions of the progress of socialist culture and socialist democracy. There is no true culture without extensive democracy. And, on the contrary, it is difficult to talk of developed democracy without the corresponding culture of the broad masses of the working people. The dependence of the political activeness of the masses upon their level of culture is well-known. As Lenin emphasized, "an illiterate person stands outside of politics" (Poln. Sobr. Soch., vol 44, p 174).

Assimilation of the entire wealth of human culture is necessary for the masses' active participation in politics and the management of social affairs. Cultivating a high political standard in the Soviet people, a standard which presupposes knowledge, conviction, an active civic position, voluntary, conscious observance of the norms of socialist society, and so forth, has special significance for fulfilling this task. Drawing people into social management requires an active struggle against any manifestation of political passivity and nihilism. It is important to persistently cultivate in every Soviet individual a sense of being master of his country, a high civic spirit and respect for democratic rights and the worth of the individual in order to ensure extensive, practical participation by the working people in the political life of society and in the management of social and state affairs.

There is no doubt that legal education has great significance for mass civic participation in the management of the state and society. It is important to ensure that the working people thoroughly understand that enjoying democratic rights and freedoms is indivisible from fulfilling civil responsibilities. While enjoying the right to work, for example, every Soviet individual is bound, in turn, to work conscientiously and observe production discipline. Speaking of ideological-educational work, it is important to bear in mind that its close connection with life, the seriousness and convincingness of the analysis of mature problems, and freshness of words and thoughts increase the individual's trust in propaganda and agitation and stimulate civic activeness and the desire to participate in the management of social affairs.

The Soviet socialist all-people's state expresses the will and interests of the workers, the peasantry, the intelligentsia and the working people of all the country's nations and nationalities. The democratic nature of our state is most fully and comprehensively embodied in the soviets of people's deputies--the representative and competent organs of state power. The fact that 2,300,000 deputies, who are supported in their activities by tens of millions of Soviet activists, are elected soviet members throughout the country is in itself exceptional in terms of the scale of representation and the expression of the people's will.

Soviet deputies are workers and kolkhoz workers and representatives of various branches of the working intelligentsia. One cannot help but recall that, as the Americans themselves admit, the U.S. state organs are "clubs of the rich," and that there is not a single worker represented in U.S. Congress. This

comparison alone convincingly illustrates to whom power belongs in our country and to whom in the leading country of the capitalist world.

In recent years, the activities of soviets in the Ukrainian SSR have been significantly stepped up. They devote particular attention to increasing the efficiency of social production, ensuring the comprehensive nature of economic and social development, educating the working people and strengthening discipline and law and order. An important concern of the soviets is to increase consumer production and to more fully satisfy the needs of the working people. Control over the work of enterprises and organizations engaged in industry, construction, transport and the domestic and service spheres is being more fully implemented. There is now greater efficiency, precision and organization in the work of the soviets. Sessions and meetings of the executive committees and permanent commissions are held regularly in accordance with the law, verification of fulfillment of decisions is improving and the appropriate organizational work is being conducted.

Exercising the vast potential of the soviets in many ways depends on further improving the party leadership over their activities and increasing the responsibility of communists elected as deputies for practically fulfilling the authority of the soviets in all spheres of state, economic and sociocultural construction. The resolution adopted by the April (1984) plenum, "On Further Improving the Work of Soviets of People's Deputies," is aimed at enhancing their role in implementing the party's socioeconomic policies and in perfecting socialist statehood and democracy.

It seems important to note a number of features contributing to the soviets' increased activity at the contemporary stage and to their enhanced role in social life.

First. The significance of the issues raised for discussion at sessions of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet as well as at meetings of its Presidium and permanent commissions has increased and the range of these issues has broadened. Thus, in recent years, in addition to every day, procedural matters, sessions of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet have discussed problems connected with the organizational work of soviet and economic organs in fulfilling the plans for the production and procurement of agricultural products stipulated by the Food Program, the tasks of the republic's soviets of people's deputies emanating from the decisions of the April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the First Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th Convocation and other major problems.

Second. The local soviets are working more efficiently and their activities have become more substantial. There are at present more than 10,000 soviets in the Ukrainian SSR, to which more than half a million deputies have been elected. The soviets are supported in their activities by more than 8 million voluntary assistants. There is virtually no problem of state, economic and sociocultural construction which would not be resolved by the soviets of people's deputies.

The strength of the soviets lies in their indissoluble link with the working masses, in the fact that they are completely under the control of and



accountable to their electors, and in the most extensive and active rights enjoyed by the organs of state power and the deputies--the plenipotentiary representatives of the people in the soviets. Unlike bourgeois parliamentarians, people's deputies in our country are not professional politicians and, after they have been elected, they do not cease their working activities at their place of work--at plants, factories and institutions.

The most active members of the labor collectives, they are constantly among their work comrades. This makes it possible for the people's elected representatives to be well aware of the needs and interests of the working people and to take them into account in their deputy's activities.

More than half of all the deputies elected from our republic to the USSR Supreme Soviet and of the deputies elected to the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, as well as almost three-quarters of the deputies of the local soviets of people's deputies, are workers and kolkhoz workers, while the rest represent various branches of the intelligentsia. The following statistics are also eloquent. More than half of the oblispolkom chairmen, 70 percent of the chairmen of city and rayon executive committees, one-third of the ministers and more than half of the leaders of enterprises and associations in leading branches of industry in our republic began their working lives as workers or kolkhoz workers.

Here is a typical example. In 1953, after graduating from an agricultural institute, V. M. Kavun began his working life as an agronomist at a kolkhoz. Under his leadership, the kolkhoz became one of the best in the republic. Vasilii Mikhaylovich was elected a member of the CPSU Central Committee, a deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet and a member of its Presidium. In 1970, he was advanced to the position of chairman of the executive committee of the Vinnitsa Oblast council of deputies of the working people, and in 1978 he was elected first secretary of the Zhitomir Oblast party committee.

Soviet law endows deputies with broad powers. Participating in the work of the soviets, they are involved in resolving problems connected with state, economic and sociocultural construction and help to implement soviet decisions and to effectively control the work of state organs, enterprises, institutions and organizations. The Soviet state guarantees every deputy the appropriate conditions for efficient activity. The right of inquiry, the right of immediate access to officials, the right to demand the elimination of violations of the law, and other rights and the entire system of guarantees of deputy activity ensure that deputies effectively exercise their powers within the soviet and in the electoral district.

The true democracy of our society is attested to by the fact that the deputy is under the control of and accountable to the electors, this being guaranteed by the constitutional right to this dismissal if he fails to justify the trust of the voters or commits an act unworthy of the high title of deputy. This right, which reflects the sovereignty of the Soviet people and guarantees the deputy's responsibility to the voter, is actually exercised in practice. During 1981-83, for example, 89 deputies were recalled by voters in the Ukrainian SSR.

Many local soviets in our republic have accumulated positive experience while exercising their powers. Local soviets in the republic's capital and in Dnepropetrovsk and Donetsk Oblasts actively influence the development of industry; the tasks of introducing new equipment and technology in Kharkov Oblast and of producing consumer goods in Lvov and Krym Oblasts are fruitfully fulfilled with their participation. The work of the soviets in Sumy Oblast to efficiently utilize land merits approval, as does the work of soviets in Cherkassy Oblast to intensively develop livestock breeding and in Rovno and Poltava Oblasts to protect the environment.

At the same time, the extensive rights enjoyed by the local soviets are still sometimes insufficiently exercised. Some deputies do not fully exercise the powers which they are endowed with by law. Instead of "using their authority" where it is necessary, they act without the proper persistency. The guarantee of successful work being done by the organs of power lies in their broadly exercising their rights and powers, in showing initiative, and in adopting a creative approach to the matter at hand.

It is particularly important that they more actively fulfill their control functions and show greater exactingness. It is a well-known fact that, in accordance with the USSR Constitution, the decisions of the local soviets must be fulfilled by all the enterprises, institutions and organizations on their territory, as well as by officials and citizens. The task lies in ensuring that these mass organs of state power exercise all their constitutional powers in practice and to the full.

Third. Enhancing the role of the soviets is not only reflected in enriching the substance of their work, but also in improving its style. Indeed, the results of the activities of an organ of power in many ways depends on how a session is prepared and conducted, how efficiently and thoroughly issues are discussed at a meeting of the executive committee or permanent commission and how control and the organization of fulfillment of decisions are carried out.

The permanent commissions, deputies' groups and labor collectives play an increasing role in the drawing up and adoption of decisions by the soviets of people's deputies and their executive and administrative organs. The initiative of the working people and statements by the mass information organs increasingly frequently serve as an incentive for adopting decisions. The democratic mechanisms by which the soviets draw up and adopt decisions should, in our opinion, be developed and perfected in every way.

A democratic and effective form of control by deputies over the activities of state organs and officials--inquiry--has recently become widespread in the work of soviets in the Ukrainian SSR. The strength of deputies' inquiries primarily lies in their publicity and in the compulsory nature of decisions adopted on them. Deputies increasingly frequently utilize this effective means of control. Thus, in 1983, 18,000 inquiries were examined at sessions of the republic's soviets. However, it is not simply a matter of their quantity, of course. The quality of work connected with them is also improving and its effectiveness increasing.

The overwhelming majority of deputies, inquiries related to vital problems of industrial and agricultural production, the organization of public services and amenities for inhabited localities, trade and domestic services for the population and the production of consumer goods. It must be said that as a rule, the feedback from inquiries of this kind is considerable. Through inquiries made by deputies in local soviets in Kherson Oblast, the construction of 11 preschool institutions, 33 shops and 17 units for municipal-domestic purposes was speeded up and more than 200 kilometers of hand-cover roads and 58 kilometers of pavement were laid. Approximately 13 million rubles were spent in fulfilling inquiries made by deputies in the oblast. More than 600 reports and information bulletins on the fulfillment of deputies' inquiries were heard at soviet sessions.

Electoral mandates--instructions given to their deputies and approved at election meetings--are a clear expression of socialist democracy. The institution of mandates exists only in socialist countries. This is completely natural, because it is only in socialist countries that the will of the voters is strictly compulsory for the deputies, who are completely under the voters' control and fully accountable to them. Electoral mandates reflect the great political and civic activeness of the working people and their mass participation in adopting decisions of local and state significance. The mandates are aimed at systematically strengthening the economy and further improving housing and municipal construction, public health care and education. By the beginning of this year, approximately 70 percent of all mandates adopted for execution by soviets of the present convocation had been fulfilled in the republic.

As a rule, the mandates set concrete tasks which are of vital significance to the voters.

For example, the mandates issued to deputies in the Zaporozhye city soviet included the reconstruction of roads and the building of a trolleybus line to the silicon polymer plant, the construction of a school in the Shevchenkovskiy Rayon and a children's center with a swimming pool and so forth. In accordance with electoral mandates, a hospital is being built for the Kommunar automobile plant and a clinic for one of its enterprises, the road and trolleybus line to the Khortitsk residential area are being reconstructed and a cinema is being built. The deputies play a vital organizational role in the fulfillment of these mandates. Thus, at the initiative of deputy to the Zaporzhye city soviet, V. V. Sadovenko, head of the V. I. Lenin river port, four major enterprises were drawn into participating in the reconstruction of the right-bank area of the Dnepr hydroelectric power plant dam. Sadovenko himself headed the deputy post for control over the reconstruction work. Efficient organizational work contributed to the electoral mandate being fulfilled half a year earlier than planned.

Fourth. The comprehensive development of publicity, which Lenin regarded as a creative force and an effective means of fulfilling standing tasks, is fundamentally important for perfecting the work of the soviets. Publicity is one of the most important democratic principles of soviet activity as determined by the Constitution. Regular accountability reports and statements by deputies and executive committee workers in the labor collectives and in

places of residence, as well as the systematic holding of deputy days, have become tried and tested forms of publicity. During the 1982-83 period, all the soviet executive committees, the absolute majority of their departments and directorates and 99.99 percent of the deputies in the republic gave reports to the population. For example, the executive committee of the Zhdanov city soviet of people's deputies in Donetsk Oblast presented accountability reports on its work during 1983 at 126 meetings in labor collectives and places of residence. Approximately 20,000 people participated in those meetings. A total of 168 of the 200 proposals adopted have already been implemented, and the rest are in the process of being implemented. Thus, at the proposal of the working people, a pioneer camp has been built in the town of Yurevka, 15 streets in the Ilichevskiy Rayon of the town have been supplied with radio programs, special interest clubs have been formed in the Metallurg and Isrka Palaces of Culture and the Azov steel combine and a considerable amount of work has been done to equip the town with services and utilities.

It goes without saying that the role of the mass information media in ensuring publicity for the work of the soviets is great. The republic, oblast, city and rayon newspapers in the Ukrainian SSR systematically present information under the rubrics "Life of the Soviets," "The Soviets at Work," "The Soviets and the Food Program," "The Executive Committee Has Adopted a Decision," and so forth. The republic's television and radio regularly highlights the work of the soviets.

Fifth. The study and fuller consideration of public opinion has great significance for further perfecting the work of the soviets. Those soviets which have activated their work in this direction in recent years and which have begun to devote greater attention to analyzing letters and proposals from the working people act correctly. Positive experience has been accumulated here by the Executive Committee of the Kiev city soviet of people's deputies in particular. The state of work with letters, statements and proposals from citizens is regularly discussed at meetings of the gorispolkom. Its leaders broadly practice visiting the working people in both their place of work and place of residence. Such forms of work as the organization of public visits and meetings between deputies and voters at major enterprises and in the micro-rayons are being actively introduced.

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that the great potentials for improving the work of the soviets that have been created by studying and considering public opinion are still insufficiently utilized. What is more, some soviet workers underestimate these potentials, while others simply ignore them. This reduces the activeness of citizens, labor collectives and social organizations in the drawing up and adopting of decisions. Of course, we strive to rectify this situation.

All that has gone before attests to the fact that at the stage of developed socialism improving the work of the organs of the state administration in every sphere acquires particular relevance. In many ways, it is precisely those organs that fulfill the aims and tasks of the all-people's state and that reflect the interests and will of all the Soviet people in their everyday, practical activities. As is well-known, a series of important

measures have recently been implemented in this direction. Nevertheless, the further process of perfecting state administration is accompanied by certain difficulties. Among others, the lack of coordination between the actions of different departments, which at times has a perceptible effect upon the final results of economic operations, is an original form of "growing pains." And although in the conditions of developed socialism the achieved level of socialization of production, particularly in the forms of interbranch integration and cooperation and integration and cooperation between agricultural units, appreciably narrows the ground for the manifestation of narrow departmental interests and the appearance of various kinds of interdepartmental collusions, nevertheless the task of overcoming departmental disconnection still retains its relevance. A most important condition for developing the creative activeness of the working people is to consistently implement measures for broadening the rights of enterprises and associations in the planning and current organization of their production activities, ensure their truly proprietary interest in improving the final results of their work, and increase their responsibility for these results.

It is important also to improve the organization and technical equipping of administrative work from now on, which will make it possible to consistently carry out work to cut down on the administrative apparatus. Concrete steps have been taken in this direction in the republic. During 4 years of the five-year plan period, the administrative apparatus has been reduced by 103,700 people, which has made it possible to reduce expenditures on its upkeep by 424.6 million rubles. The administrative structure is being systematized at all levels. This year, for example, the posts of 124 members of collegia of republican ministries, including 35 deputy ministers, were eliminated.

The strengthening of legality and law and order and the strict and consistent observance of legal norms have great significance for further perfecting Soviet statehood and socialist democracy. While proclaiming and actually ensuring the most extensive possible human rights and freedoms, which create the necessary conditions for the individual's comprehensive development and active participation in the management of the affairs of society and the state, socialism simultaneously decisively rejects so-called absolute, completely unrestricted freedom of the individual. Such freedom has never existed anywhere and cannot exist anywhere. Freedom of the individual under socialism is based on unity of personal and social interests and on unity of rights, freedoms and responsibilities.

Socialist democracy has nothing in common with a liberal attitude toward antisocial behavior. It presupposes strict exactingness toward all who encroach upon the established order and utilizes their rights and freedoms to the detriment of the interests of society and the state and the rights of other citizens. This kind of "freedom," which our class enemies would like to force upon us, is rejected by the Soviet people. The calling to account of those persons encroaching upon our state and social system is carried out in full accordance with the USSR Constitution and Soviet legislation, which fulfill the principles and norms of international law.

Of course, the chief responsibility for strengthening legality and law and order rests with the procurator's office, the courts, the organs of justice and the militia, whose most important task has been and still is that of persistently struggling against violations of the law. Together with social organizations and labor collectives and with the aid of organizations such as the comrades' courts and the voluntary people's militia, these organs are called upon to guarantee by their activities the strictest possible observance of legality in all spheres of state and social life, and also in economic relations and to ensure the reliable protection of the socialist economic system and socialist property and the rights and interests of Soviet citizens. The party committees and state organs in our republic conduct persistent work to put an end to any cases of abuse of official position and bad management. In accordance with CPSU Central Committee directives, increased attention is being devoted to strengthening legality, improving the work of the organs responsible for maintaining law and order and increasing the responsibility of leading workers for general organization and discipline. The people approve and support this consistent policy.

One can say that a steady requirement of socialist democracy and the order of the times lies in ensuring that the broad masses of the working people become increasingly active participants in all work to perfect management and to overcome existing shortcomings.

As is well-known, the political system of Soviet society organically combines state and social forms of democracy. Social organizations are indispensable participants in all political campaigns, including those such as nationwide discussions of draft laws and other party and state directives. For example, approximately 120 million people participated in the discussion of the draft school reform. A total of 1.3 million meetings were held, at which 7 million people spoke. Social organizations participate in the norm-creating activities of the supreme and local soviets, in the organization and verification of fulfillment of laws and party and government resolutions, and in the elections of soviet deputies, the people's courts and the people's assessors. They are represented in the state organs, in particular in ministry collegia and in all-union and republican directorates and in various consultative organs. Social organizations participate in controlling the work of the state organs and help to develop the political activeness and spontaneous activities of citizens and to satisfy their various interests.

An extensive and ramified network of social organizations, which are becoming increasingly mass and representative in nature, has taken shape in our country. The trade unions are the largest of these organizations. Having accepted millions of kolkhoz workers into their ranks, the trade unions now embrace virtually all the working people. In the Ukraine, there are 26 million people in the ranks of the trade unions and more than 135 million throughout the country as a whole.

The tasks and rights of the trade union organizations are extremely broad. They are concerned with the development of the national economy and the growth of production and, at the same time, protect the rights and legitimate interests of the working people and adopt measures to improve their working and living conditions. They are called upon to develop socialist competition,



help the working people to develop the skills of managing state and social affairs, and extensively draw workers, employees and kolkhoz workers into production management. The trade unions have extensive possibilities at their disposal for fulfilling these and other tasks: They have a right to participate in the drawing up of enforceable enactments concerning matters of production, labor and culture, in the formation of organs of economic leadership and management and in the drawing up and implementation of plans for social and economic development.

Thus, in the course of discussing and adopting plans and socialist obligations in the republic for the year 1984, social organizations and labor collectives carefully examined their economic validity and practicability, as well as ways of fulfilling plans to increase labor productivity over and above the plan as well as to reduce prime production costs and revealed unutilized reserves and potentials. Many proposals were introduced at meetings of enterprise collectives in which approximately 8 million people participated, these proposals being aimed at further perfecting production, promptly and qualitatively fulfilling plan tasks, improving the conditions for labor protection and fulfilling other social tasks.

The drawing up of counterplans was the effective result of the discussion. Whereas in 1983, several hundred industrial enterprises adopted the most important indexes of these plans, in 1984 more than 2,000 production collectives are already working successfully on their basis. By fulfilling counterplans, the volume of sales of products will increase this year by 400 million rubles, while the number of workers will be reduced by more than 2,000 as opposed to the plan. The trade unions do a great deal to develop socialist competition, invention and rationalization.

All problems relating the organization and remuneration of labor and the working people's leisure are resolved by the state organs with the participation of the trade unions and while taking their opinion into account. The Soviet trade unions have their own large material resources at their disposal, which are utilized for protecting the health and organizing the leisure of the workers. A considerable number of sanatoriums and health resorts and cultural-educational and sports institutions are in their charge. They also manage state social insurance. The Communist Party has always regarded and continues to regard the trade unions as a powerful instrument for developing socialist democracy and for drawing the working people into social and state management and as its reliable support in the masses.

The Leninist Komsomol--the front-rank detachment of Soviet youth and an active assistant to the party--occupies an important place in the political system of developed socialism. In contemporary conditions, the party sets the Komsomol new, large-scale tasks in the cause of accustoming the new generation of builders of communism to aware, creative work, to multifaceted activity in the perfection of developed socialism and to participation in the management of state and social affairs; educating young people in the spirit of communist ideals and forming in them great ideological conviction and an active position in life. This is precisely the aim of the recently adopted CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Further Improving Party Leadership of the Komsomol and Enhancing Its role in the Communist Education of Young People." The



September (1984) Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum outlined comprehensive measures for its practical implementation in the republic.

Growth in the economy and the further development of the social activeness and political culture of the popular masses naturally lead to a deepening of democratic principles in every sphere of our life, including in its determining sphere--production. A special role is played by the labor collectives in consolidating these principles, since it is in the labor collectives that new, socialist qualities are cultivated in the worker, the organic unity between social, group and personal interests, as well as relations of friendship and comradely mutual assistance, are formed and broad possibilities for actively participating in production management open up before the working people. The USSR Law on Labor Collectives clearly defines their broad rights and tasks. Although this law has only recently come into force, it has already had an appreciable effect upon increasing the social and labor activeness of the workers class and all the working people.

Further perfection of democratic principles relating to management in the sphere of the economy has become manifest in the development of collective forms of organizing and remunerating labor according to final results. The brigade work method, which has already been adopted by two-thirds of all workers in the republic, has caused the appearance of new organizational forms of social self-management, such as brigade meetings and councils and councils of brigade leaders. Being organs of primary labor collectives, they ensure active participation by the workers in systematizing the production process, selecting and distributing the cadres and discussing and resolving problems connected with work remuneration and material incentives. The worker in the brigade learns production management in practice.

This yields results. Production brigades working on collective contract at progressive enterprises in the republic are achieving a growth in labor productivity of 5-10 percent and even higher indexes in some cases. For example, at the Dnepropetrovsk metallurgical equipment plant, the labor productivity of workers in complex brigades has increased by 15-20 percent and their wages by 7-8 percent.

Favorable prerequisites for enhancing the role of the working people in management are taking shape at enterprises working in the conditions of the large-scale economic experiment that has been begun in the country. As analysis of the activities of 52 enterprises and associations in the republic participating in the experiment shows, its implementation helps to increase the efficiency of social production, develop the creative activeness of the labor collectives and form a new kind of economic thinking among enterprise workers. The responsibility of production collectives for precise fulfillment of delivery plans has noticeably increased. Almost all enterprises and associations have considerably reduced expenditure on production. The new conditions of economic operations contribute to the fulfillment and overfulfillment of plan tasks relating to the growth of labor productivity. The entire growth of production output has been achieved on account of this factor.

The struggle to accelerate scientific-technical progress has really become a nationwide cause. Scientific and production collectives are being broadly drawn into introducing scientific achievements into production. It is natural that matters of scientific-technical progress are at the center of attention of the party committees. Councils for assisting scientific-technical progress have been formed and are in operation under the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine and the oblast party committees. Various forms of technical creativity are being further developed and the ranks of rationalizers and inventors are swelling. During 1983 alone, the economic effect of utilizing their proposals on the country's national economy amounted to almost 1.5 billion rubles. The feedback from the activities of scientific-technical societies and other associations of the working people is increasing.

In his speech at a session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on 15 November 1984, Comrade K. U. Chernenko emphasized that the extensive introduction of the achievements of science and technology into production is today the foundation for the effective development of the national economy. Considering the existence of certain weaknesses in this sphere, the Politburo has deemed it necessary to examine problems concerning the acceleration of scientific-technical progress and the perfection of management in every sphere of the economy at the next CPSU Central Committee plenum in order to achieve a radical change in this vitally important aspect of our development.

Today, the problems of technical reequipment are increasingly resolved with orientation toward the final result, economic and social effectiveness and the development of the very personality of the worker. The experience of the Dnepropetrovsk K. Ye. Voroshilov combine plant collective, which has received the approval of the CPSU Central Committee, is well-known in this respect.

This collective conducts purposeful work to increase production efficiency on the basis of certification, rationalization and elimination of morally obsolete work places. The experience of the Dnepropetrovsk workers has already been applied by 250 enterprises in the republic and another 4,100 collectives (this is two-thirds of their total number) are preparing to introduce this experience.

The CPSU Central Committee resolution notes that perfecting the organization of production and labor on the basis of certifying work places and rationalizing them has great economic significance, is an effective form of implementing the policy of the 26th Party Congress and of subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums to increase the economy's efficiency, helps to draw the working people into production management and is conducive to their more fully exercising the rights granted them by the USSR Law on Labor Collectives.

A form of participation by the broad masses of the working people in the management of state and social affairs--people's control--is acquiring increasing importance. It is a question of creating control which, to quote Lenin, would be "truly universal, general, and national, and therefore impossible to avoid in any way" and "there would be nowhere to go" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 33, p 101). People's controllers in the republic conduct active work to verify the fulfillment of party and government decisions,

reveal production reserves, help to introduce the achievements of science and technology and struggle against bad management, waste, extravagance, bureaucratism, red tape and other shortcomings.

Thus, for example, extensive participation by the working people in control over the expenditure of material and energy resources in the republic has made it possible to substantially economize. At the same time, life makes increasingly great demands on people's control. It was emphasized at the All-Union Conference of People's Controllers that the people's controller is called upon to actively participate in work to improve our economic mechanism and to help reveal and eliminate everything that runs counter to the nature of socialism and that is at variance with its ideas.

Socialist self-government presupposes consistently implementing the principle of democratic centralism, organically combining state and social principles in society's political system and enhancing the leading and guiding role of the communist party. These distinctive features of socialist self-government emanate from the very nature of the new society and from the objective laws of its functioning and development.

The comprehensive deepening and broadening of socialist democracy is an essential feature of the political system of all countries in the socialist community. "...The development of socialist democracy is the main aspect in perfecting our political system," emphasized Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria. "The development of socialist democracy is not a slogan, not an index that we wish to reach in order to boast before the world. For us it is a vital necessity."

As the international experience of real socialism shows, in those cases where the party-political nature of socialist management is underestimated or, what is more, undermined, and where trust is put in spontaneous-market regulating instead of systematically sustaining basic economic proportions, difficulties inevitably arise in implementing large scale reproduction, and in particular, in ensuring full employment on a nationwide scale, in pursuing the policy of distribution according to labor and so forth. As a result, the socialist organization of production and labor is broken, the economy suffers loss, the vital interests of the working people are encroached upon, and, in the final analysis, the threat of the restoration of capitalism is created.

Thus, if aware, planned management is squeezed out by the spontaneous regulating of a decentralized economy, there can be no question of any real people's self-government: Where spontaneity reigns, the people are not in command.

The Soviet experience of forming and developing socialist democracy has vast international significance. It is creatively utilized primarily by fraternal socialist states and countries of socialist orientation, and it is a source of inspiration for all consistent fighters against imperialism, reaction and war, and for peace, democracy and socialism.

Refuting the slanderous fabrications of imperialist propaganda, this experience attests to the fact that real democracy is one of the most important advantages of the socialist system over the capitalist system. This experience makes it possible to more clearly and deeply perceive the incurable ills and antinational essence of bourgeois democracy, which is a form of dictatorship of capitalists and an instrument in the domination of the propertied minority over the indigent majority.

Bourgeois democracy serves as a means of preserving the capitalist ownership of the means of production, the exploitation of labor by capital and the political and spiritual enslavement and oppression of the working people. Bourgeois democracy is limited because it is incapable of granting every citizen all his proclaimed rights and freedoms in practice. It is hypocritical because, while demagogically declaring equal rights for its citizens, it condones the oppression of man by man.

Under certain sociohistorical conditions, by utilizing the might of the state machine, the ruling class of capitalists eliminates and liquidates even those very limited democratic rights, freedoms, and institutions which have been won and established in the course of a long, intense struggle by the working people against exploiters, resorts to violence and terrorist methods of government on a broad scale, and plants dictatorial, totalitarian, semifascist and fascist regimes. Contemporary bourgeois democracy is experiencing a serious crisis--one of the manifestations of the general crisis of world capitalism.

As far as the plans of reactionary imperialist forces are concerned--plans to turn people away from socialism by means of blackening and distorting socialist statehood and democracy--then these plans are doomed to failure. The achievements of real socialism in all spheres of social life serve as an inspiring example for the working masses in their struggle for democratic freedoms and rights, for liberation from the oppression of capitalist exploitation and for the preservation and strengthening of peace.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/5

## INDISSOLUBLE REVOLUTIONARY CONTINUITY OF GENERATIONS

AU130701 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84)  
pp 44-56

[Article by L. Zaykov, first secretary of the Leningrad CPSU obkom]

[Text] The party leadership of the youth movement is the prime condition for and the most important guarantee of the revolutionary continuity of generations in the socialist society. It is on this tested principle of lasting political significance that the CPSU bases its position on the implementation of Lenin's immortal precept: For youth it is to learn communism and for the party it is to teach youth communism.

The fundamental tenets of Lenin's historic address at the Third Komsomol Congress have been further creatively developed, in application to the conditions of mature socialism, in the address by Comrade K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at the all-army conference of secretaries of Komsomol organizations and in the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee "On Further Improving the Party Leadership of the Komsomol and Increasing Its Role in the Communist Education of the Youth." These documents are a striking expression of the party's fatherly care for the young builders of communism and they determine important measures for intensifying the work with the growing generation and they formulate in an exhaustive way the Komsomol's tasks at the contemporary stage.

### I

The Leningrad communists, just like the entire party, have accumulated rich experience in the leadership of the youth movement in the struggle for the revolutionary transformation of the world. V. I. Lenin, the bolsheviks and the Great October Revolution were at the source of this experience.

As early as at the beginning of 1917, the Petersburg committee of the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party (of the Bolsheviki), fulfilling the instructions of its leader, set the course toward forming truly revolutionary youth organizations. Shortly after the 6th Party Congress, which marked the beginning of a new stage of the proletarian youth movement, the Petrograd Socialist Union of Working Youth was formed and as such represented the

immediate predecessor of the Leninist Komsomol and united in its ranks 13,000 young boys and girls.

On the eve of the historic events of October 1917, nearly all worker members of the Petrograd Union joined the Red Army ranks. The young members of the Red guards guarded the Smolnyy headquarters of the revolution and actively participated in the assault on the Winter Palace and in the defeat of counterrevolutionary mutinies.

From the very first days of the formation of the organizations of the Russian Communist Union of Youth, the Petrograd bolsheviks, following the instructions of the party Central Committee, made great efforts to ensure that these organizations would become training schools for conscious communists who would be vitally devoted to the cause of the October Revolution. And the Petrograd Komsomol members justified the trust placed in them. In 1918 alone, about 10,000 members of the Union of Youth joined the ranks under the battle banners of the Republic of the Soviets. Many of them died on the fronts of the civil war in fierce battles against Kolchak and Denikin, Yudenich and Wrangel and the foreign interventionists.

During the period of industrialization and collectivization of the national economy, the Leningrad Komsomol members, led by communists, solicitously carried the flame of revolutionary traditions to the fronts of socialist construction. They invested their youthful energy in building the first projects of socialist industry in Siberia, the Urals and in the country's southern regions and in fulfilling the extensive industrial reconstruction of Leningrad.

Responding to the first call of the motherland, the Komsomol rose in defense of the achievements of the October Revolution in the bloody fighting against Hitlerite fascism. The war and work feats of the young men and girls of besieged Leningrad will live forever in our hearts and in the memory of the future generations. The city's Komsomol organization was awarded the Order of the Battle Red Banner in recognition of its heroism in the Great Patriotic War and of its active participation in socialist construction. More than 176,000 Komsomol members, young soldiers and partisans, valiant defenders of the cradle of the October Revolution, were awarded USSR orders and medals, and 196 of them were awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union.

As always, the youth stood shoulder to shoulder with the communists at the foremost front of the struggle for the reconstruction of the national economy devastated by the enemy.

It built plants and factories on the ruins of cities and villages, rebuilt the architectural monuments of Leningrad and its suburbs and cleared and rebuilt streets and squares.

In the middle of the 1950s 19,000 young Leningrad volunteers actively participated in the unprecedented virgin lands projects. In the Pavlodar Oblast alone they helped organize 16 sovkhozes. The taming of the virgin lands is a bright chapter in the annals of the history of the Leninist Komsomol.

The selfless work of the youth in the most important national economic projects is a worthy continuation of the heroic accomplishments of older generations. The services of the Komsomol organization of the Kirov Plant in building the first giants of the steppes, the Kirovets tractors and the work of the Komsomol organization of Kirishi city in the all-Union Komsomol shock construction project were recognized by the fatherland by awarding the Orders of the Labor Red Banner to these organizations.

Hundreds of young workers and engineering and technical workers have been awarded high state awards for the construction of the Fosforit combine, the V. I. Lenin nuclear power plant in Leningrad, the Sayano-Sushensk hydroelectric power plant and the industrial capacities for the production of nuclear energy equipment. The routes of labor enthusiasm of the young men and girls who received their Komsomol travel passes in Lenin's city run from the fields and farms of the Russian nonchernozem regions to the vast areas of the Far East and High North. On the monument glorifying the labor of the builders of the Baykal-Amur Mainline railway Leningrad Oblast is listed among the names of the union republics, krays and oblasts whose envoys have built the railway. This is a recognition of the services of the communists and Komsomol members, the young men of the city and oblast, those who, under severe and often extreme conditions, laid the track of the Northern Siberian railways and built Severobaykalsk and the settlements and stations of the Baykal-Amur Mainline railway and those who have made their contribution to the development of the production forces of Siberia and the Far East.

Our youth is undertaking with ardent interest the tasks that are most important for the country. Today it lives with the intense rhythm of the 11th Five-Year Plan Period and is passing a responsible test in fulfilling the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums.

The Komsomol's great contribution to the cause of communist construction is simultaneously also a most important result of the party leadership of the Komsomol which ensures the purposeful activity, ideological loyalty, militancy and creative activeness of the youth union.

The Leningrad party organization attaches an exceptionally great importance to the education of new generations of fighters for communism and to further increasing their labor and political activeness. The practical solutions of the youth problems--however diverse they may be--directly depend on the extent to which the new generations actively struggle for the interests of the socialist state. The following conclusion of Comrade K. U. Chernenko is especially topical at the contemporary stage of social development: "We can and must make our society such that it will correspond to the highest and most exacting notions about socialism. To the notions that were scientifically substantiated by Marx, Engels and Lenin. To the notions that inspire the working people and the popular masses in the entire world to the struggle for socialism. To the notions that have never allowed us to rest on our achievements or to become reconciled to shortcomings and omissions."



Having moved to the foreground the task set by the party--to fully include Komsomol members and youth in the difficult and diverse work in perfecting the developed socialist society--the communists of Leningrad and the oblast are profoundly aware of the strategic importance of this task. What is involved in this connection is a matter of ensuring that the younger generation will prove to be ready to assume the historical responsibility for the country's future and for the fate of socialism and peace on our planet.

## II

The extensive program of Komsomol actions in the economy has been clearly and accurately formulated in the party Central Committee resolution and in Comrade K. U. Chernenko's statements. The program mobilizes youth to successfully fulfill the tasks of the 11th Five-Year Plan and the food and energy programs, to fulfill the tasks connected with the intensification of the national economy, the acceleration of the scientific-technical progress, the complex automation of production and the development of electronics and nuclear power, to develop and introduce fundamentally new materials, equipment and technology and to master the economic methods of economic management.

The Leningrad party organization considers these questions to be of key importance for its activity. Defining the methods of fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee Resolution "On Further Improving the Party Leadership of the Komsomol and Increasing Its Role in the Communist Education of the Youth," the plenum of the party obkom discussed these questions in close relation to the basic directions of economic and social development of the region during the 12th Five-Year Plan Period and with the prospective development envisaged by the first unified general plan for the development of the city and the oblast in the next 20 years.

The efforts of young workers are thereby concentrated on the most important and most difficult practical tasks faced by Leningrad people in the process of perfecting developed socialism. The political and educational activity is also raised to a new level and developed on the basis of a firm interconnection with the plans of complex economic and social development of Leningrad and Leningrad Oblast. The experience gained from the preparation and implementation of these plans, which began in the 9th Five-Year Plan Period, has confirmed their importance as the organizing basis for the entire ideological activity that is directly connected with the ripe questions in the spheres of the economy, production, work, everyday life and recreation of Leningrad people. The unity of the long-term planning of political-educational work and of the socioeconomic development permeates all levels, ranging from the primary cells of production collectives to the administrative rayons and to Leningrad and the oblast as a whole.

This makes it possible to avoid any discrepancy between words and deeds. However, the main thing in this connection is that, as it were, the horizons of everyday activity of party and Komsomol organizations are thereby widened and Comrade K. U. Chernenko has very precisely expressed the essence of this activity: "...To teach the people to think in a broad socioeconomic and political context, to translate the economic, social and other tasks into the

language of educational actions and the educational tasks into the language of economic and organizational actions."

This approach undoubtedly enriches the contents of the party leadership of the Komsomol, makes it possible to conduct education on a wide front that embraces all aspects of the formation of the personality of young builders of communism and encourages them to actively participate personally in the implementation of party policy. Thanks precisely to this approach, many party organizations have succeeded in achieving a high level of work and political activeness of the youth, and the latter's work has assumed a greater social substance and extended beyond the framework of narrow production problems.

This work includes the struggle to increase labor productivity in excess of the plan and achieve an additional reduction of production costs and spread the initiative of the collective of the Baltic S. Ordzhonikidze Plant for prefulfillment of the tasks of the 11th Five-Year Plan, the initiative approved by the CPSU Central Committee and the struggle for socialist competition under the slogan: "Entire growth of production volume through technical progress and the maximum utilization of equipment and economy of resources."

The territorial and branch program of intensification of the economy on the basis of accelerated introduction of scientific-technical achievements in the national economy of Leningrad and Leningrad Oblast ("Intensification-90"), which has been approved by the CPSU Central Committee, has become one of the main elements of engaging the forces of Leningrad's young people and an important instrument of increasing their contribution to the realization of the party's economic strategy.

A unified scientific-technical policy for the entire region both for the present and future periods has been elaborated and comprehensively substantiated in this document. The program includes the construction and introduction of the latest machines, mechanisms and technology within a short period, the application of contemporary electronic and computer equipment and robots and the transition to flexible automated production processes, to automated planning and designing systems and to advanced methods of work and management organization.

Under these conditions, the party obkom, gorkoms and raykoms and the primary party organizations strive to ensure, on a solid organizational basis, the development of a mass movement of the Leningrad Komsomol for mastering the highest contemporary scientific and technical achievements and for considerably broadening the training of young skilled cadres in conformity with the requirements of the present stage of the scientific-technical revolution.

It is for this purpose that all labor collectives have worked out and are implementing, with the active participation of Komsomol committees, their own long-term plans for raising the professional standards of workers and specialists. All enterprises have organized their own economic study courses for the problems connected with the realization of the "Intensification-90" program and of other special purpose all-Union programs. These study courses

are further enhanced by practical lessons in the schools of advanced experience and in the universities of economic and technical knowledge.

In the current year, more than 700,000 workers and about 400,000 leaders and specialists will raise their qualification levels and more than 100,000 of them will be trained in new professions and special skills. To solve with honor the tasks of increasing the effectiveness of the Soviet economy, young workers must persistently strive to master the latest achievements of science and polytechnical knowledge and constantly concern themselves with restructuring the economic thinking.

Actively participating in the implementation of the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers "On Measures to Accelerate Scientific-Technical Progress in the National Economy," the leading higher- and medium-level educational institutions and the professional-technical schools of the city have introduced this year a broad training program for cadres in 20 new prospective long-term special skills connected in particular with the development and introduction of flexible production technologies, robot-technical complexes and computers. Thereby a solid basis is being built for the fulfillment of the directions of Comrade K. U. Chernenko concerning the contemporary cadre policy and complementing the cadres with new forces that will be suited to solving the contemporary tasks.

At the same time, during its discussion of these questions, the party obkom has uncovered major reserves in the work of higher educational institutes, technical schools and professional technical schools. What is required in this connection, for instance, is a more substantiated planning of admissions to educational institutes which would more fully take into account the demands of the national economy and the practical requirements of the Leningrad economic intensification program and, at the same time, it is necessary to provide for an intensified training of the school youth in progressive methods of work and production organization.

We are now already able to form, on the basis of long-term contract relations with enterprises and institutions, large production training complexes to train highly qualified cadres who will be up to the high demands of the period. The solution of this task will depend in many respects on perfecting the distribution of young specialists. It is necessary to ensure that, already during the period of their training and practice beginning with the third or fourth year, they will be able to actively participate in the life of the collectives in which they will work after they have completed their studies in the institutes or technical colleges. This approach will reliably join together all links of the chain of ties between the higher- and medium-level specialized schools and production.

Major organizational work is required to mobilize the Komsomol organizations of all plants, workshops, or sections in fulfilling the goals set by the party. This is why the party committees are taking steps to intensify the role of the primary Komsomol cells in the life of labor collectives where the ideological-political, work and moral components of communist education are concentrated in the focal point of practical actions.

The Komsomol obkom, gorkoms and raykoms are now drafting a long-term plan for participation of Komsomol members and youth in the fulfillment of the territorial-branch program of acceleration of scientific-technical progress in the oblast, every rayon and every enterprise all the way to the individual workshops and brigades. And the work in this connection starts from below, from the individual creative plans of Komsomol members, whose slogan is expressed in the precise formula: "Production intensification is your Komsomol duty and battle task!"

We understand distinctly that this program must be well-planned and systematic and must be built on a unified methodical basis. New attempts have been made in this direction: In particular, the council of young scientists and specialists of the Komsomol obkom has formed a commission for interaction in the development and introduction of robot technology in the national economy of Leningrad and the oblast. Several interesting conferences have already been held and quite an extensive address program of patron enterprises has been worked out.

So far, 22 complex creative youth collectives have actively started practical work for the introduction of robot-technical systems and the number of these collectives will constantly grow. More and more attention is devoted to studying and spreading their experience. The oblast seminar that was held last year and discussed various problems connected with the participation of the youth in the development and introduction of robot technology played a useful role in this connection.

The experience thus accumulated makes it possible for the oblast Komsomol organization under the leadership of Leningrad communists to more quickly progress in solving the tasks set by the "Intensification-90" program and, since this program embraces all branches of our economy, to draw to this task all categories of cadres and the masses of young workers included in the movement for mastering the highest contemporary scientific and technical achievements. Not unimportant is also the circumstances that, at the same time, the Komsomol committees are essentially increasing their role in coordinating the efforts of young scientists, specialists and workers and in drawing them to solving the largest national economic problems.

There are examples such as the following:

The Komsomol organizations of the A. A. Zhdanov shipyard, the Lenelektronmash Scientific and Production Association and several other enterprises have initiated a movement the purpose of which is to include wide circles of the youth in the development and introduction of flexible automated production processes. The initiative of Komsomol members of the Elektrosila Association is aimed at ensuring an active participation of the youth in the economic experiments in perfecting the work remuneration for designers and technologists. The target of the shock work of young men and girls of the Izhorskiy Zavod association is to produce new electric power equipment for the Yuzhno-Ukrainskaya, Zaporzhskaya and Balakovskaya nuclear power plants and to prepare one of the country's largest metal sheet rolling mills, the 5,000 mill, for commissioning for production operations. The youth of the Baltiyskiy plant have assumed patronage over the construction of the nuclear

icebreaker Rossiya. The completion of its construction ahead of schedule will be a labor gift of Leningrad people to the 27th CPSU Congress.

The work in fulfilling the "Intensification-90" program is only just gathering force. But the activities of Komsomol organizations for accelerating scientific-technical progress in the associations of the Kirov plant, Svetlana, the metal-processing plant, the Leningrad electromechanical plant, the V. I. Lenin Optical-Mechanical Association and many other enterprises already now deserve high appraisal.

No matter which of the branches of the Leningrad economy we may consider, either the industry, agriculture, transport, or the sphere of services, a wide field of activity is opening up everywhere before the Komsomol, a field of activity that requires the romance and heroism of regular everyday labor efforts.

The youth of Leningrad and the oblast have made a major contribution to the construction of the unique installations that are unparalleled in world practice. A 2,000-member volunteer detachment represented the backbone of the collective of this All-Union Komsomol shock construction project. Working together with older comrades, this detachment now wages an intense struggle to complete the construction of the first stage of the hydrotechnical complex ahead of schedule for the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution.

The young builders of the metro subway are also engaged in a shock labor watch and have achieved several labor records in building the underground tunnels. Supported by the Komsomol organizations of a number of industrial enterprises which have assumed patronage over filling all orders for the Leningrad Metro Construction Trust ahead of schedule, they have pledged to commission for regular operations the right-bank line of the Leningrad metro system considerably ahead of schedule.

Hundreds of Komsomol youth harvest and transport detachments and teams, thousands of young agricultural workers in battle order have completed the harvest of crops and the procurement of fodder for social livestock breeding. The Komsomol milkmaids and mechanizers were the first in the oblast to pledge to prefulfill the five-year plan tasks by the opening day of the 12th World Youth and Student Festival. This initiative has now won mass support.

The most important economic and political questions connected with the implementation of the decisions of the October (1984) CPSU Central Committee Plenum and of the propositions and conclusions outlined in the profound and brilliant speech of Comrade K. U. Chernenko at that plenum are now at the center of attention of the youth and all people of Leningrad.

The party obkom discussed at its plenum the results of the October CPSU Central Committee plenum and determined the main directions of organizational and mass political activity of the Leningrad Komsomol members in fulfilling the responsible assignment set by Comrade K. U. Chernenko, the assignment of placing in the service of the Soviet people millions of hectares of restored land. The formation of the volunteer Komsomol youth land melioration detachments that were joined by the oblast Komsomol organization is a working

response of the young workers of the city and oblast to this appeal. Continuing the traditions of the virgin lands workers, hundreds of young men and girls will come to villages with their Komsomol travel orders in the very near future.

Recently the party obkom approved the proposal of the Leningrad Komsomol organization to assume patronage over the construction of several major water resources projects. These projects have been proclaimed the oblast's Komsomol shock construction projects. It has been decided to dispatch to these projects student construction detachments of many higher- and medium-level specialized education institutions, together with volunteers from various enterprises and from the Komsomol organization.

Giving their due to the successes in the fulfillment of the economic and cultural construction plans, continuing to count on the manual skills, daring ideas and labor valor of the younger generation, the party speaks frankly about the shortcomings that are characteristic of it. The Komsomol has quite a sizeable utilized potential in introducing order and in ensuring a high level of organization and discipline in production operations. Among the youth there are still some individuals who fail to fulfill the tasks of their work shift, allow idling and violate the social order. It is very important for the Komsomol organizations to fully use, in the struggle against these negative phenomena, the extensive rights granted them by the Law on Labor Collectives and the USSR Constitution.

The great educational significance of the brigade contract is well-known. It develops in young workers a sharper sense of mutual responsibility for the final work results and improves the moral climate in brigades. Although this is a difficult and painstaking process that requires an approach thought out to the last detail, the CPSU obkom has set the task: to enter the new five-year plan period by ensuring a general transition of the Komsomol youth collectives to progressive forms of production organization and work remuneration.

Interesting and responsible work in the intensification of social production and acceleration of the scientific-technical progress is in store for the younger generation. Ensuring a fuller utilization of the scientific and production potential and achieving continuous uninterrupted functioning of the entire economic mechanism, this is the key task in the activity of Komsomol organizations and in the entire work of the party and people in further perfecting our social system.

### III

The party Central Committee especially stresses the need to further perfect youth's ideological education. The Leningrad party organization has approached the fulfillment of this fundamental instruction, enriched by the experience gained in the process of implementation of the decisions of the June (1983) CPSU Central Committee plenum and of the Central Committee's resolution "On Further Improving the Ideological and Political-Educational Work."



The more complicated the tasks set by the party become, the more perfect and reliable must be the organizational forms ensuring their fulfillment. Proceeding from this fact, the communists of Leningrad and the oblast have lately taken a number of measures dictated by the striving to considerably strengthen the entire system of ideological-political education of youth. What concretely is involved here?

What is involved first and foremost is the formation of the councils for social and economic development and acceleration of scientific-technical progress that were recently organized within the framework of the party obkom and all gorkoms and raykoms. The task of the bureaus for communist education and training of cadres which operate within the framework of these councils is to thoroughly study the ideological work with youth and assist the party committees in determining its concrete directions on the basis of scientifically substantiated positions, ensuring the removal of any departmental barriers from the activity of numerous institutions that are engaged in the education of young workers and coordinating the efforts along the entire chain of the education process, ranging from the family and schools and education institutions to labor collectives.

The aforementioned bureaus operate under the leadership of party organs, in close contact with the appropriate commissions of party committees, with the local soviets of people's deputies and with trade unions, and rely on the support of a wide Komsomol aktiv. All this creates the necessary conditions that make it possible to embrace in practice the multifaceted measures of communist education of the youth within a single unified complex, to closely tie in this complex with the economic and social development plans and to extend the ideological-political influence to every individual young person in Leningrad.

It is important to emphasize that the work started is a logical continuation of the entire preceding activity of the oblast party organization in ensuring a complex and harmonious development of all aspects of the production, spiritual and cultural life of youth. The purpose here is--and we are aware of that--to utilize more effectively the accumulated experience and apply it more actively and creatively.

The primary task set by the party is that of forming in youth an integral Marxist-Leninist world outlook, educating young boys and girls in the spirit of unshakeable loyalty to the fatherland, and instilling in them high moral qualities based on the example of Lenin's life and activity. The Council of CPSU Veterans for Propaganda of Revolutionary, Battle and Work Traditions and the Education of Workers and Youth, which has been formed by the party obkom, is making a major contribution to this work. The council is headed by Hero of Socialist Labor V. P. Vinogradov, a CPSU member since 1915 [date as published].

The Leninist examination that was initiated in Leningrad city some time ago and the forms of which are being constantly perfected is an effective form of making Leninism accessible to the younger generation and increasing its labor and sociopolitical activeness. In many Komsomol organizations this test does not involve only an appraisal of the sociopolitical views of young boys and



girls but also an appraisal of the results of their everyday work of patronage over the families of war and labor veterans and of soldiers killed on the battle fronts, and of organizing the corners of battle and labor glory in schools, educational institutions and production enterprises. It is in these concrete, admittedly small, but good acts that the ideological conviction and moral integrity of Komsomol members and their aspiration to be worthy continuators of the glorious traditions of their fathers and grandfathers are formed.

The party organizations have increased their attention to the Komsomol political training in the process of comprehensively perfecting the ideological work among youth. Formalism and conventionalism or routine repetition of truisms are categorically counterproductive to this training. In the current year, quite a great deal has been accomplished to create in the primary Komsomol organization an atmosphere of demanding and exacting attitude toward the reorganization of political training that is called upon to help every Komsomol member--to use Lenin's words--"to act as communism in fact demands him to act" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 41, p 302).

The training programs are now aimed to a great extent at developing the ability of the young participants to independently examine the topical problems of contemporary life and to apply in practice the knowledge that they have acquired and to apply this knowledge also to thorough analysis of economic activities in their own enterprises. Following this path, the party and Komsomol committees have expanded the network of economic schools.

The contents and orientation of the entire work in the political education of youth are most directly predetermined by the tasks connected with Leningrad's successful completion of the 11th Five-Year Plan Period, with a worthy preparation for the 40th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War and with preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress.

Simultaneously with the Komsomol training, the party obkom and the party organizations in the field have begun to pay greater attention to improving the effectiveness of direct contacts of the party, soviet and economic leaders with youth. It has become a rule that, within the framework of unified political days, older comrades visit youth halls and there hold frank discussions on the tasks and life of the younger generation, vital problems of the contemporary period and the domestic and foreign policies of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

The educational process, as well as the entire process of formation of the individual, with its entire complex nature and all their dependence on the multitude of the most heterogeneous factors originates in the family. However, we find some parents who try to shift the entire responsibility for any delinquency of their children to the schools or the Komsomol. Unfortunately there are quite a few examples of this kind. They impel the party organizations to intensify their attention to the problems connected with the performance of parental duties. The school reform that is now in progress places these problems within the entire development.

What paths have we followed to increase the responsibility of parents and primarily communist parents for the education of their children? A clear answer to this question is provided by the agendas of the workers' and party meetings in Leningrad enterprises and party organizations. More and more often they include reports by parents to labor collectives and party organizations on the behavior and moral character of their children. As a rule, the results of examination of these reports are taken into consideration in the preparation of social references for workers and in connection with advancement or promotions in their work.

This path perhaps does not solve the problem completely. It is understandable then that, being very exacting toward members of labor collectives as regards the fulfillment of their parental duties, it is necessary to extensively help them in this respect. Therefore the parents' universities, lecture meetings and consultation points for young parents have been widely introduced in our oblast directly in production enterprises. The Komsomol committees carry a considerable share of care for the pedagogical upbringing of youth.

The experience of the Leningrad party organization in preparing a worthy complement of the workers class through the professional-technical education system is well-known. About 70,000 young production workers graduate annually from the professional-technical schools in the city and the oblast. The professional-technical schools are not the only place where qualified cadres for various branches of the economy are trained but also one of the leading centers of ideological-political and moral training of youth. This experience was discussed at the June (1983) CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The remarkable movement of youth teachers, numbering now some 70,000 members, has been initiated in the Leningrad professional-technical schools. Constantly striving to ensure that the national economy is provided with highly skilled, literate and politically mature young men and girls, educated in the revolutionary, battle and labor traditions of the workers class, the party obkom is being successful in qualitatively perfecting this mass movement.

Practical steps are now being taken to enrich the teaching with new forms of work. It is planned to open about 100 schools of innovators that will be headed by such illustrious teachers as, for instance, Twice Hero of Socialist Labor V. S. Chicherov and Heroes of Socialist Labor V. R. Parshina and B. A. Zhuravlev. In these schools, the young workers in leading professions engaged in the most important branches of Leningrad's and the oblast's national economy will receive instruction in the advanced experience in perfecting the organization of production work, equipment and technology. In our opinion, the schools of Chiverov, Parshina, Zhuravlev and many other instructors and innovators will be an effective form of communist education and of raising the standard of professional training of youth.

The CPSU Central Committee charges the party and Komsomol organs with the care for ensuring the continuity of the educational process in the family and schools, in production activities, in social life and in the free time outside work hours. Interesting work in places of residence is now being carried out

in this respect in Leningrad, and the experience is also spreading further through the oblast.

For instance, following an initiative of the CPSU gorkom, all residential microrayons in Gatchina have been assigned to the party and Komsomol organizations of the city's labor collectives. A coordination council formed by the party gorkom and operating in close contact with the gorispolkom and groups of deputies and permanent commissions of the city's soviet of people's deputies assists them in the ideological-training and cultural-educational work with youth and the population. As a result of this work, the educational work in places of residence has been greatly activated.

Thus, four people's universities for problems of communist education, a "young soldier" club, a school of young lawyers, several health groups, and a study and consultation point in the dormitory have been set up recently in one of the Gatchina microrayons with the assistance of the collective of the Burevestnik plant. What is especially valuable in this respect is that these measures have had a favorable impact on the state of social order and have contributed to a decline in violations of law by young people. Similar examples can be found in many rayons in Leningrad and the oblast.

Proceeding from the request made by the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, we have simultaneously begun to solve yet another topical problem. It is well known what a great role in the ideological-political, cultural-educational and mass defense work with youth is played by clubs, houses and halls of culture and sports facilities. However, because of the contradictory interests of scores of different departments to which they are subordinated, there is room for improvement in the effectiveness of their utilization. It would be possible (as the experience of the Omsk Oblast shows in particular) to eliminate this shortcoming and advance the matter from a dead end without any additional state expenditure by forming cultural and sports complexes through a certain organizational restructuring and through overcoming the departmental barriers.

The party obkom has determined concrete goals in this sector of work. The executive committees of local soviets of people's deputies, the oblast trade unions and the oblast komsomol committee have been instructed to complete, in the current five-year-plan period in all rayons of Leningrad and the oblast, the introduction of the new projected form of leadership of cultural and sports facilities affiliated with various departments, and set up 39 cultural and sports complexes that would unify the efforts of the organizations which concern themselves with the population's leisure time.

We are well aware of the fact that the problem of efficient utilization of leisure time continues to represent a bottleneck in the system of education of the growing generation. This problem is felt especially acutely in some youth dormitories where so far few changes for the better have been made in the organization of leisure time and in ensuring the elementary standards of everyday life. Briefly, the Komsomol has not yet become a good and concerned manager. Its role in work with youth during nonworking and nonstudy time as a whole must be considerably greater.

At the same time, it is clear that what is needed in this work are the joint efforts of all interested sides, that is, the party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organs and economic leaders of enterprises and organizations. Considering the possible organizational forms of unification and coordination of their actions, we have concluded that the ways of solving the problem should be worked out in detail in a complex program for "Organization of Youth's Leisure Time" that would be valid for the city and the oblast. Work is now in progress to formulate this document. It is headed by the Bureau for Communist Education and Cadre Training of the party obkom's Council for Economic and Social Development and Acceleration of Scientific-Technological Progress which operates in close contact with the oblast Komsomol committee. A wide circle of young workers, scientists and specialists has been included in this work.

Of course, it is difficult to deal all at once with all the multifaceted problems connected with the contemporary youth movement. The CPSU Central Committee's resolution and Comrade K. U. Chernenko's speeches encourage us to concentrate our attention first and foremost on improving the style of party leadership of the Komsomol. The Central Committee stipulates that this leadership should combine the absolute organizational independence of Komsomol organizations with a maximum comradely attention and assistance extended to them by communists, should systematically ensure real activeness of all links of the youth union and should direct this activeness to the necessary channel.

The shortcomings listed in the CPSU Central Committee's resolution are found also in the activities of several of our party committees. Thus, the obkom plenum severely criticized the Slantsy gorkom, the party committee of the Zvezda Association and several other party committees for their lack of attention to the tasks and concerns of the Komsomol. These facts have been evaluated in a principled manner and we are striving to ensure that the necessary conclusions are drawn from these criticisms.

Only a short time has passed since the adoption of the party Central Committee's resolution "On Further Improving the Party Leadership of the Komsomol and Increasing Its Role in the Communist Education of Youth" and the speech by Comrade K. U. Chernenko at the all-army conference of secretaries of Komsomol organizations. During that period, general meetings, plenums and meetings of aktivs have been held by the party and Komsomol organizations in all rayons and labor collectives of Leningrad and the oblast and state organs, trade unions and ideological institutions at which the positions and conclusions of these most important party documents were discussed with interest and the methods of effectively fulfilling the tasks set by them were outlined. All aspects and directions of the long-term complex plans for communist education of youth that have now been worked out and implemented are constantly controlled by the CPSU obkom, gorkoms and raykoms.

One of our main concerns is a further strengthening of the party nucleus in the Komsomol. At present in Leningrad and the oblast, nearly 50 percent of all Komsomol organizations are headed by communists and one third of members of their elected organs are party members. More than 200 most authoritative Komsomol leaders and activists have been elected as members of the bureaus of the CPSU gorkom and raykoms and of the party committees of primary party

organizations. One-third of the deputies of local soviets are young people. Many of them are students of the Leningrad Higher Party School and of the schools of party and economic activists of the CPSU gorkoms and raykoms. We consider all this as the necessary condition for widening the party influence in the Komsomol as the vanguard of youth and the party's reserve.

At present, 63 percent of the new generation of party ranks pass precisely through the Komsomol. As a rule, they are the worthiest representatives of the younger generation of the workers class and of the engineering-technical and creative intelligentsia. Experience has shown that the schools of young communists actively assist party organizations in forming the qualities of political fighters in the youth. Virtually every candidate now prepares for admission to the CPSU membership by passing through a saturation theoretical and practical training and by cultivating a high sense of responsibility for party membership.

Raising the level of the world outlook and political standards of young communist leaders of the Komsomol is in many respects a guarantee for improving the entire activity of the Komsomol and has a noticeable impact on perfecting the style, forms and methods of this activity. Although it is obviously too early to speak about any major changes in this direction, some changes have already begun to show. The accountability reports and elections show that Komsomol members have seriously applied their efforts to the task of bringing order and discipline into their activity and of eliminating formalism and excessive organization from it. We persistently strive to ensure that the Komsomol's entire organizational work will gravitate toward the primary organizations and groups in which young boys and girls receive their communist tempering and that the positive trade developing in the youth movement under the direct impact of the measures worked out by the CPSU Central Committee will gain force with every day.

These measures will undoubtedly further the organizational-political strengthening of the 800,000-member oblast Komsomol organization, one of the leading detachments of the Leninist Komsomol, and its increasing contribution to solving the tasks of perfecting developed socialism.

Preparing together with the entire country for the 27th CPSU Congress, the Leningrad people are concentrating their efforts on successfully completing the plans for this year and the entire five-year period. And in this connection the oblast party organization is clearly aware of its responsibility for the fulfillment of the program for the further development of the Soviet economy as worked out by the October CPSU Central Committee Plenum of the party and of the instructions outlined by Comrade K. U. Chernenko in his speech at the meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on 15 November 1984, including the stipulation that it is necessary to build a good and firm basis for the 12th Five-Year Plan.

Preparing for the 40th anniversary of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War, the working people of Leningrad and the oblast have delivered industrial products for more than 247 million rubles in excess of the plan since the beginning of the year. The entire increase of the production volume has been achieved through an increase in labor productivity.

In the January-October period, labor productivity increased by 1.4 percent in excess of the plan and production prime costs were reduced by 0.5 percent in addition to the planned reduction.

On 29 October, the Leningrad Oblast prefulfilled the state procurement plans for grain, potatoes and vegetables for the current year and the 4 years of the 11th Five-Year Plan. Altogether 136,500 tons of vegetables, 73,700 tons of potatoes, 12,000 tons of grain, 18,400 tons of meat and 62,500 tons of milk above the plan will be sold to the state for the 1981-84 period. The procurement plan for course and succulent fodder has been overfulfilled. The supply of potatoes and vegetables stored for winter will fully meet the needs of Leningrad's people.

The social tasks are being successfully solved. New housing and schools have been built according to plans and new hospitals, clinics, stores, service enterprises for the population and many other social and cultural projects are under construction.

All labor collectives of Leningrad and the oblast have adopted intensive socialist obligations aimed at prefulfilling the tasks of the 11th Five-Year Plan. The entire activity of the oblast Komsomol organization is now subordinated precisely to this goal.

The Leningrad communists perceive it as their duty to improve the party leadership of the Komsomol, increase its role in communist construction and intensify work in the education of youth in the spirit of ardent devotion to our Leninist party and the cause of communism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/5

## VITALLY IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF THE MARXIST CONCEPT OF ABSTRACT LABOR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84) pp 57-69

[Article by A. Melent'yev, candidate of economic sciences]

[Text] Abstract labor is a very important category in Marxist theory of value. The bifurcation of labor into concrete and abstract, the qualitative and quantitative definitenesses of abstract labor -- that "substance that creates value" -- pertain to the most profound secrets that were discovered by the genius of Karl Marx concerning the commodity form of the social economy, which form received its highest development under capitalism. Denying capitalist production relations, real socialism, as has been demonstrated by historic practice, does not destroy all at once the relations of commodity production in general. But whereas, under the conditions of the new society, the latter remain to one degree or another a reality, it is specifically the abstract labor preserved in various specific manifestations that forms the "substantial basis" of the actual value forms that are functioning in socialist society. Therefore it is completely understandable that, outside the reference to the teaching of the classic authors of Marxism concerning the essence of abstract labor, the degrees of its evolution, and historic fates, it would seem to be scarcely possible to obtain a genuinely scientific (and, consequently, significant for the practical aspects of management) resolution of the complicated and still largely moot problems of commodity-monetary relations under socialism.

### 1

According to the well-known definitions provided by Marx in "Capital" and the political-economic works that preceded it, abstract labor is primarily "labor in general," that is actually revealed as the physiological expenditure of manpower, "the productive expenditure of the human brain, muscles, nerves, hands, etc..." (K. Marks [Marks], F. Engel's [Engels], "Soch." [Works], Vol 23, p 53 (hereinunder, references to the Works of K. Marx and F. Engels will be given by volume and page only). In contrast to the concrete forms of labor which have different quality, which are distinguished "by their goal, the nature of operations, the object, the means, and the result" (Ibid., p 50), this is labor of identical quality, "one and the same human labor" (Ibid., p 53). And inasmuch as "the qualitative measurement of operations presupposes the homogeneity, identity of their quality" (Vol 46, Part I, p 117), it is



precisely this labor of identical quality which constitutes the sole basis for a realistic equation, in definite proportions, of the heterogeneous concrete forms of labor and their results -- the various consumer values.

However, abstract labor is not simply labor that is physiologically homogeneous. The latter represents only the "material substratum" of labor that forms the value. The expenditure of physical and nervous efforts is a mandatory factor in human labor, one that is independent of the social conditions and in this sense is extrahistorical. In order to become "abstract," physiologically homogeneous labor must undergo specific changes, must take on a definite historical form. This conversion occurs under the action of the basic contradiction in commodity production between private and social labor.

The revelation of the essence of this contradiction would seem to be scarcely possible without first ascertaining (albeit in the most general features) the content of its component aspects. "Social labor" is labor "for others," the work performed by people "for one another" (see Vol 23, pp 49, 81), the production ties among them. Social labor evolves organically from the social division of labor, which "constitutes a condition for the existence of commodity production, although commodity production, conversely, is not a condition for the existence of the social division of labor" (Ibid., p 50). But Marx defines "private" labor as the direct opposite of social labor, as the denial of the ties among people in production, as the "independence," the "isolation" of the producers (see Ibid., p 51; Vol 13, p 20), as their "purely atomistic functioning" (see Vol 23, p 103).

However, as was intensively emphasized in a number of annotated research works on Marx's theory of value, the contradiction being considered consists not only in the fact that the labor performed by the economic subject is simultaneously private and social. By acting directly, physically as private (isolated) [labor], this labor in a mediated, "hidden" manner, in its internal capability and necessity proves to be social. In other words, although every isolated economic unit, as a link in the system of the social division of labor, works "for others," for society (manufactures social consumer values), these "others," society, do not impute to this unit any qualitative-quantitative parameters of labor activity. All the factors of concrete labor which is intended to satisfy a definite social need (its means, subject, goal, etc.), do not act as an "a priori," as factors that were assigned by society prior to the process of production, but, rather, are regulated by the "atomized" subject of management himself, at his own "risk and peril." And therefore in the immediate labor process there is a deep secret as to whether or not the true social consumer value is being produced (whether or not the output being produced is needed to satisfy an existing social need), and whether the corresponding labor expenditure serves as a particle of the gross social labor or it will be "credited" by society. "The secret become obvious" only "by a roundabout way," in the market exchange of the created products, when the direct process of production has already been completed, has "expired."

But the contradiction between private and social labor finds its closest form of development, which arises in the direct process of production. in the

bifurcation of labor into concrete and abstract. Concrete labor becomes an expression of private labor, and labor of identical quality becomes an expression of social labor. But it is not simply social, but that which is not directly social. In other words, the physiologically identical quality of labor as such receives an "additional" and by now specifically socioeconomic load -- the load of being a form of expressing the potentially social labor (social labor that acts as a "hidden," internal factor in directly-private, isolated labor). "...Labor that forms a single principle of values," Marx emphasized, "is not only identical, simple, average labor. Labor is the labor of a private individual, which is represented in a definite product. However, like value, the product must be the embodiment of social labor... Private labor, consequently, must reveal itself directly as its opposite, as social labor; this converted labor, as the direct opposite of private labor, is abstractly universal labor, which, therefore, expresses itself in a certain universal equivalent" (Vol 26, Part III, p 137).

Labor, as such, which is physiologically of identical quality (the literally material process of expenditure of the physiological energy of a person) is a direct factor in the labor of every isolated managing subject (and therefore can be "caught" and directly measured in work time). But as it becomes a form of expressing the potentially social labor and is converted, by virtue of this socioeconomic function that it has, into "abstract" labor, universal human labor proves to be a "hidden" aspect of the production process.

The qualitative content of abstract labor is one of the conditions for its internal gauge -- "socially necessary labor." Marx points out that, from the social point of view, all the producers of a given commodity must expend per unit of that commodity equal quantities of labor of equivalent value (see Vol 13, p 18). But under the conditions of the complete isolation of the producers that actually expend for the given consumer value the most varied "portions" of that labor, the identical, the equal, is possible only as an average. Therefore, "socially necessary work time" acts as "that which is necessary on the average," and, correspondingly, "every individual commodity in this instance has significance as an average copy of its kind" (Vol 23, pp 47, 48). Like the qualitative definiteness of abstract labor, its internal gauge is not represented in the isolated production directly.

As a "hidden" factor, abstractly universal labor cannot be directly expresses in the hours of work time, but, rather, carries within itself the absolute inner necessity of being "objectified" in the value (which, in its turn, is manifested in the exchange value and money). Putting it another way, the content of abstract labor (social labor, which in a hidden manner opposes the immediately private labor) influences the value as a mandatory objectival form of its expression. Value thus proves to be people's social relation in the specific form of the relations of things (products of labor), it "conceals behind things the social nature of private operations, and, consequently, the social relations of the private workers..." (Ibid., p 86).

2

Marx's views on abstract labor are typified by a profoundly historical approach. According to that approach, the crux of the matter is not simply in

the fact that abstract labor at a certain stage of social development arises, and at some of stage disappears. First of all, throughout its historical existence, abstract labor has not remained as something that has been given once and for all, but rather, in a certain manner, changes its qualitative and quantitative definitenesses. Secondly, the entire tremendous historical evolution of abstract labor has as its foundation the corresponding evolution of the contradiction of the directly private (isolated) and hidden social labor.

The beginning of the history of abstract labor was linked with the development of the contradiction between private and social labor: as early as the casual exchange of products of labor between two primitive communal societies there was a real manifestation both of the factor of the social nature of labor (the episodic work performed by one communal society for another), and the factor of its private nature (the isolation of the production of the communal societies with respect to one another, since the labor is directly socialized only on the scale of each of them). During that historical period abstract labor and its expression -- value (and, correspondingly, exchange value) -- only arose, and were still in the "embryonic" state. The further evolution of abstract labor and, on its basis, value and exchange value, occurs by virtue of the buildup of the opposition between private and social labor. It is influenced by the origination and deepening of the social division of labor, on the one hand, and by the appearance and development of various forms of private ownership, on the other. A qualitative leap forward in the evolution of the basic contradiction of commodity production -- the conversion of it into the basic contradiction of capitalism (on the basis of the conversion of manpower into a commodity) -- elevates abstract labor and value (which now becomes "self-increasing value," capital) to their historic zenith. "...The abstraction of the category 'labor,' 'labor in general,'" Marx noted, becomes "practically true only as a category of the most modern society" (Vol 46, Part I, p 41).

At the same time, it was scientifically proven precisely by Marx and Engels that the development of capitalism leads to the arising of the need to eliminate the basic contradiction of commodity production and, on that basis, abstract labor and its form -- value. The founders of Marxism, and subsequently V. I. Lenin, proceeded from the hypothesis that the historic mission of capitalist society consists in the complete development of the social nature of the productive forces. This is the vastly increasing socialization (linked primarily with the increase in the concentration and specialization of large-scale machine product, and with the deepening of the multifaceted and ramified system of the social division of labor) "persistently requires the planned regulation of production and social control over it..." (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 3, p 545).

The cause which, under conditions of productive forces which are highly socialized in their nature, leads to the preservation of labor that is private in the socioeconomic sense is the private appropriation of the means of production which was inherited and broadly reproduced by capitalism, the fact that they actually belong to private individuals. "The means of production and production, in essence, have become social," Engels wrote. "But they

remain subordinate to that form of appropriation which has as its premise the private production of individual producers... The method of production is subordinate to that form of appropriation, despite the fact that it destroys that premise" (Vol 20, pp 281-282). Consequently, private appropriation serves here as the basis of private labor and the contradiction between private and social labor, which contradiction now acts as an "absorbed" factor in the content of the basic contradiction of capitalism. It is from this circumstance that Marx and Engels made the conclusion: if one destroys private-capitalistic appropriation and transfers all the means of production to the social ownership of the workers themselves, then, with the elimination of the basic contradiction of capitalism, one will also see the complete disappearance of such an inseparable factor in its content as the contradiction between private and social labor. Something else that disappears is a necessary consequence of that contradiction -- abstract labor and its objectival form, value. What comes to replace them is direct socialized labor that has been organized in a planned manner. That labor, according to Marx, represents a "form of production that is diametrically opposed to commodity production" (Vol 23, p 104). Thus, Engels wrote in "Anti-Duhring": "Once society takes possession of the means of production, commodity production will be eliminated, and, together with it, the dominance of the product over the producers. The anarchy within social production is replaced by planned, conscious organization" (Vol 20, p 294).

The thesis according to which, under socialism, one will see the elimination of the basis for the bifurcation of labor into concrete and abstract, and also, consequently, the basis for the existence of the value form of the products of labor, was developed in Marx's "Theory of the Gotha Program" (see Vol 19, p 18). Although Marx writes that, in the first phase of communism, "there predominates the same principle that regulates the exchange of commodities," he simultaneously emphasizes: its content and form have changed (Ibid.). The "principle" consists in that "every individual producer gets back from society, after all deductions, exactly as much as he himself has given to it" (Ibid.). This equivalent exchange between the society of workers as a whole, as the owner of the means of production, and each individual worker, as their associated owner (co-owner), absolutely necessarily presupposes the reduction of all the concrete types of labor to labor that is of identical quality, and therefore is qualitatively comparable. However, as has already been extensively argued by a number of authors, one cannot consider specifically this labor of identical value to be "abstract." Since in this instance labor that is identical quality, in the physiological sense, expresses not the hidden social nature of the labor activity of the directly isolated producers, but a completely different production relation. In conformity with the latter, every individual worker, by being included as part of the single gross manpower that employs in a planned manner the socialized means of production, creates true social potential value. Putting it another way, he works for society directly, that is, he carries out labor activity in accordance with a strictly determined production program which entirely, in all the qualitative-quantitative parameters of concrete labor, has been issued by society even before the beginning of the productive process. In turn, the society of the workers as a whole reproduces each individual member not simply on the basis of its gross expenditures of labor, but precisely through the intermediacy of the socially acknowledged expenditures of labor by that

worker, which are qualitatively distinguished from the corresponding labor expenditures of other workers. Having as its basis the considered production relation, labor of identical quality assumes not the form of abstract labor, but a completely different socioeconomic form. The latter, expressing the fact that "individual labor no longer by a roundabout way, but, rather, directly exists as a component part of the gross labor" (Ibid.), unlike abstract labor, is not a "hidden" factor, but a form that exists physically and functions in production. Hence the two fundamental peculiarities in its internal gauge.

First, "socially necessary labor" here is distinguished from "socially necessary labor" as a gauge of abstract labor: instead of the "average" expenditure, it becomes expenditures which can be called arbitrarily differentiated-individual ones. We have in mind a number of expenditures that are differentiated depending upon the objective conditions of production in which the workers (and their collectives) that are producing the homogeneous consumer value find themselves. Marx emphasizes the thesis according to which "principle and practice here (that is, under socialism) no longer contradict one another, whereas, in the event of commodity exchange, the exchange of equivalents exists only on the average, rather than in each individual instance" (Vol 19, p 19).

The thesis to the effect that what is immanent to a commodity economy is not equivalency in general, but a special, specifically historical form of it -- equivalency "only on the average, rather than in each individual instance" -- cannot be related exclusively to the sphere of circulation, where, as a consequence of interbranch competition, there are deviations of prices from the values. Marx's idea characterizes first of all the circumstances of a more profound order, which are linked with the process of production of value, of forming the internal gauge of the abstract labor that constitutes its substance. We have in mind the "averaging" of the individual expenditures of labor, the spontaneous social "equating" of the commodity producers who are under objectively unequal branch conditions of management. In production units that function under objectively worse conditions, the amount of socially necessary labor that is produced per "copy" of the particular commodity is less than the amount of individual labor, and in units with conditions that are objectively better, the expenditures of socially necessary labor prove to be... greater than the ones that are actually carried out!

Thus, in the process of intrabranh competition, which establishes the size of the market value of the unit of commodity of the particular type, there is a "hidden" (but actually existing!) redistribution of work time among the commodity producers. Putting it another way, what acts as an immediate factor in the process of production of value is the appropriation "without any equivalent" of part of the work time of the producers who are located under objectively worse conditions by the producers who are functioning under conditions that are objectively better. Therefore the equivalency that is immanent to commodity production, even if it could exist in a form that has been "purified" of the noncoincidence of prices and values, would still contain within itself a tendency toward the profound substantive inequality of the subjects that are operating in an isolated management, and toward... inequivalency and exploitation.

As for equivalency "in each individual instance," which equivalency determines the specifically socialist form of socially necessary expenditures of labor of identical quality as a form of "differentiated individualization," it is opposed to "commodity equivalency," and removes the contradictions of the latter. It is exceptionally important, however, to keep in mind the following: by constituting the internal basis (a basis having its roots in the sphere of the immediate process of production) of the law of distribution according to labor, equivalency "in each individual instance" regulates not only the labor exchange between each individual worker and society as a whole, but also the corresponding exchange between the enterprise collective and society. The second type of exchange can be represented by the formula -- "the collective expended for the production of directly social consumer values just as much labor as it receives from society (after the deduction of certain needs of the latter)." This exchange is only an objectively necessary consequence of the first type of exchange, since, under socialism, a worker who acts as a true productive worker is the "composite enterprise worker," who determines the quality and quantity of the social consumer values being produced, just as he determines the expenditures of live and embodied labor for them. This principle has also been substantiated in the literature.

Secondly, the internal gauge of the special labor of identical quality that is being considered exists in the form of the direct comparison of the labor expenditures that have actually being carried out by the individual workers and the production collectives, and the social norms of labor which have been established in a differentiated manner (imputed to those workers and collectives) even before the process of production.

Naturally, the new socioeconomic form of labor of identical quality which is immanent to socialism does not bear any inner necessity to be "objectivized" in value. Unlike abstract labor, it is possible here to observe the expression of the expenditures of labor of identical quality directly in the work time. Pointing out that "when society gets possession of the means of production and uses them for production in a directly socialized form, the labor of every individual person, however different its specific useful nature is, also becomes, from the very beginning, directly social labor," Engels simultaneously emphasized: "...Since the quantities of labor that are included in products are in this instance known to people directly and absolutely, society cannot take it into its head also to express them in the future... in a third product, rather than in their natural, adequate, absolute measure, which time is" (Vol 20, p 321).

Universal labor of identical quality, in the relationship being considered, represents the direct opposite of abstract labor. Although both types of labor are primarily physiologically homogeneous human labor, as socioeconomic categories they are fundamentally different. In the literature it has already been noted many times that the terminological definition given for the form of labor of identical quality, which form is immanent to the socialist production process that is directly socialized on the scale of the national economy, must be different from that for "abstract labor." Formulas have been suggested, for example, for "pseudoabstract labor," "labor of identical quality, which is directly expressed in work time," and "directly social 'labor in general.'"



In our opinion, to designate the socioeconomic form of labor of identical quality that is internally inherent in socialism and that is alternative to abstract labor, it is completely acceptable to use the working term "labor of identical quality, in directly socialized socialist production."

3

Under conditions of real socialism, which is at the present time on the initial step in the stage of its maturity, there occurs, however, not only "labor of identical quality, in directly socialized production," but also true abstract labor.

In the previously cited discussions relative to the views of the classic authors of Marxism concerning the essence of abstract labor and its evolution, there would seem to be sufficient motivations for asserting the following: when studying any forms of the historic existence of abstract labor, it is necessary to proceed only from the same basis of that labor that Marx himself proceeded from -- from the contradiction between the private (directly isolated) and the social (hidden social) labor. But if this is so, then, how is it possible to assure the "compatibility" of the theory of value and the fact of the existence of abstract labor in a society in which the dominant type of production that dominates is production that is organized in a planned manner and that is directly socialized on the scale of the national economy?

The question that has been asked has been a central one in the many years of discussion concerning the historic fates of abstract labor. That discussion, which became especially heated in the second half of the 1920's and which has been periodically renewed in the course of the subsequent development of the economic theory, has not led to the complete uniformity of opinions to this day. The summing up the final results of the discussion undoubtedly still lies ahead of us. However, the fundamental resolution of the problem can be seen only on the paths of developing the following thesis, which already exists and which has been actively defended in the literature: Although social ownership does eliminate the basic contradiction of commodity production in all those forms in which it existed during the period of the dominance of private ownership, real socialism with its existing level and the social nature of productive forces does not eliminate immediately absolutely all the vestiges of that contradiction.

Definite methodological arguments in favor of this thesis evolve from Lenin's theory of monopoly capitalism -- imperialism. According to its essence, at a certain stage in the historical development of capitalist society, with the achievement of an exceptionally high level in the social nature of the productive forces, private appropriation in its function of preserving and reproducing the directly isolated (private with regard to socioeconomic form) labor (and the contradiction between private and social labor) proves to be incapable of opposing with absolute effectiveness the "pressure" of socialization. There is an "undermining" of the basic contradiction of commodity production and commodity production itself. This undermining has as its invariable reverse side the arising and development of elements (under conditions of the dominance of private appropriation, it is precisely "elements" only!) of a planned nature that goes beyond the confines of



individual production units (and that is carried out by private monopolies, as well as by the bourgeois state that is "coalescing" with them (see "Poln. sobr. soch.", Vol 27, p 322; Vol 31, p 444; Vol 33, pp 67-68). This tendency was precisely stated many years ago by Engels. He wrote, "If we make the transition from joint-stock companies to trusts, which subordinate to themselves and monopolize entire branches of industry, then what comes to an end is not only private production, but also the lack of a planned nature" (Vol 22, p 234).

It is well known that, inasmuch as socialism represents only the first phase of the communist method of production, the creation of a level and nature of productive forces that are adequate to the latter (and, in principle, inaccessible for capitalism) is not a premise, but, rather, the historic mission of the stage of developed socialism. One of the concrete expressions of this circumstance is the fact of the fundamental homogeneity of the parameters of technical-technological socialization in the socialist countries and the leading imperialistic states. We have in mind the specific condition of the social nature of the productive forces that are based on a highly concentrated and thoroughly specialized system of large-scale machine industry. They already include a defined tendency toward the formation of a single type of technical-technological cooperative action on the scale of the entire national economy, but are still far from having achieved that qualitative stage of development, and preserve a certain dissociation of the productive process at the places where the spheres, branches, regions, and individual economic units come into contact with one another.

In this regard there arises the well-known historical paradox: the level of the social nature of the productive forces which, under the conditions of the dominance in imperialist society of private-capitalistic appropriation, "undermines" with objective necessity the basic contradiction of commodity production (and gives rise to the previously mentioned elements of a planned nature), under conditions of the dominance in socialist society of social appropriation continues in just as planned a manner to give rise to elements of directly isolated labor that "break through" the nationwide planned nature, respectively elements of the contradiction of the directly-isolated and hidden-social labor.

Elements ("birthmarks," "vestiges") of the contradiction between directly-isolated and hidden-social labor evolve, thus, from the relative imperfection of the technical-economic socialization (from the previously mentioned preservation of a definite localization, "point-orientedness" of the process of production, from the fact that the social nature of the latter has not yet become, to use Marx's words, "a technological truth"). They exist in special forms that are unknown to presocialist history, forming the real content of the concept of "not completely mature directly-social labor." These elements (elements both from the qualitative and quantitative point of view) of the "old" contradiction, while being preserved only in the "pores" of the universal planned organization of the social economy, are precisely what serve as the true basis for reducing concrete labor to abstract, for making an object out of the latter in value and, in the final analysis, the functioning of the entire complex of the meaningful commodity-monetary relations that exist under socialism.

The immaturity of directly-social labor has a number of forms of existence, which define both the various national-economic spheres for reducing the concrete labor to abstract, and also the nonidentical degree to which the qualitative-quantitative definitenesses of the latter is expressed in those sphere. Limiting our analysis to only one of them -- the nationwide sector of the economy -- we can note that directly-social labor reached its greatest maturity precisely in this sector. But here too socialist society, with the existing level of development of the social nature of the productive forces, is objectively incapable of taking into consideration or predicting, by means of a hierarchical system of centralized planning, the action of all factors of production, or actually (rather than formally only) of determining all the qualitative-quantitative parameters of the economic activity of each of the tremendous mass of "primary" economic units (enterprises and associations). To the degree to which a number of these parameters (including the indicators pertaining to the variety and products list for the output being produced) are determined not in a centralized manner (not by a socioeconomic center by going through its subordinated, complicated "pyramid" of branch and territorial planning agencies), but directly by the "primary links" in the economy themselves, the final, actual social recognition of the consumer values being produced by them, as well as the corresponding labor expenditures by the collectives at the enterprises (associations) occurs only "a posteriori," after the completion of the process of production, in the sphere of exchange. The latter sphere, consequently, take on certain features of the "market."

Elements of real isolation in the economic activity of the "primary links" that are working for society (and that are producing, in principle, the directly-social consumer values), and, correspondingly, elements of the contradiction between the directly-isolated and the intermediated (hidden)-social labor performed by the collectives at enterprises (associations), form the foundation -- that is internal for the nationwide sector -- for reducing the concrete labor to abstract. Therefore it would be erroneous to treat true abstract labor that functions in the nationwide sector as though it were a univocal and the sold socioeconomic form of labor of identical quality or as labor that possesses all the definitenesses that are typical of the high degree of development of abstract labor.

The peculiarities of abstract labor (which evolve from the fact that there is such a considerably undermined state of the basic contradiction of commodity production, that, as was already mentioned, it is correct the pose the question not about the contradiction itself, but only about its "elements") are of a trinary nature. First, abstract labor by no means possesses the monopoly on the role of the form of expressing the work performed by enterprise collectives for the society of the workers as a whole. To the dominating degree to which the activity of that collective acts as truly directly-social activity, that role is objectively fulfilled by concrete labor. That means that the consumer values, to a decisive degree, are produced by the collective as true social consumer values, which, from the very beginning, correspond, with respect to their qualitative-quantitative indicators, to the scientifically defined need of society.

Secondly, on the surface of phenomena, it would seem that all the expenditures of labor of identical quality performed by the enterprise (association)

collective for the consumer values to be produced take on the form of expenditures of abstract labor. Actually, however, on the part of those economic relations between the particular collective and society in which the truly directly-social labor is being realized (the collective's work for society, which is direct and which is expressed primarily by concrete labor), this "taking on" often has the nature that is purely for outer appearance only. In essence, what occurs here is the reduction of concrete labor to "labor of identical quality, in directly-socialized socialist production." What serves here as the justification for reducing the concrete labor to labor of identical quality is not the contradiction between the directly-isolated and hidden-social labor, but, rather, the previously noted relationship of the work performed by collective for society and the reproduction by society of that particular collective through the socially recognized expenditures of the labor performed by the latter, which labor expenditures differ quantitatively from the corresponding expenditures by other collectives. It would seem that the economists are right when they feel that it is this specific equivalent labor exchange that constitutes the most essential factor in maintaining the relation of cost accountability. However, this circumstance is not always taken into consideration, and "socialist cost accountability: is sometimes computed exclusively "according to the department" of purely commodity categories. This opinion is partially "justified" by the fact that, under the conditions of real socialism, the cost-accountability relation of society and the labor collective also contains the elements of the contradiction between the directly-isolated and hidden-social labor which are being considered, and which form the basis for reducing the concrete labor to true abstract labor. The latter, "intertwining" with the "labor of identical quality in directly-socialized socialist production, is reflected on it, and this creates the objective appearance of the commonality and oneness of the forms of expenditures of abstract labor under socialism.

Thirdly, the quantitative definiteness of abstract labor as an average-social expenditure of labor of identical quality is also, to a considerable degree, undermines and changed. Labor is "averaged" only to the degree to which its expenditures for the particular consumer value directly depend upon the actions of the enterprise collective or the workers that constitute it. Socially necessary labor thus received a dual and contradictory content: it is partially the "average-social" expenditure, and partially (to the degree to which the unevenness of the expenditures of labor by the various collectives per unit of homogeneous product has been determined by the objective conditions of production and does not depend upon the efforts of those collectives) -- the "individualized" expenditure.

Thus, there exists a subordinate and substantially limited place for abstract labor in the system of relations of socialist production. The real process of reducing concrete labor to abstract is revealed only at those "points" in those relations where society, by virtue of the existing state of the technical-technological socialization, is forced to resort not to the direct, but the indirect regulation of production in its primary links. And if the victory of socialism, a victory that establishes the dominance of labor that is directly-socialized on the scale of the national economy, gives completely sufficient justifications for speaking about a descending historical line of evolution and concerning the gradual dying out of abstract labor, then the

origin and beginning of the perfecting of developed socialism solidifies those justifications.

The new stage in the "in-depth" development of directly-socialized labor has received reflection in the chief documents of the party and the government in recent years. The decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent plenums of the Central Committee, and the statements by Comrade K. U. Chernenko, direct the practice of management primarily to the improvement of those methods of administration that evolve organically from the fundamental advantages of our economic system as a system in which there is planned, organized production on the scale of society as a whole.

In these documents, in particular, one can discern the line at the sharp and definite increase, at all levels of socialist management (and primarily at the level of the cost-accountability link -- the enterprise and association), of the role of the indicators of concrete labor (qualitative, in-kind, variety and products list), and to the conversion of them into the basic planning and evaluation indicators. The objective process of the development of concrete labor as a form that is immanent to mature socialism for expressing the work performed for society by the collectives of production units is also attested to by the measures being undertaken by the party and the government to reinforce planning, technological, and labor discipline, and shipment discipline; measures to develop and implement comprehensive programs for the standardization of output; measures to convert the enterprises and associations to ties that are "direct" (that realize the state plans with regard to products list, that are monitored and provided with material-technical support by agencies of centralized administration, and, consequently, are intermediated by the socioeconomic center) and prolonged.

The intensification of the socioeconomic "load" of concrete labor is also reflected by the principles in the party and governmental documents concerning the necessity for the fundamental improvement of the normative base. Under conditions of an increase in the scope of production by enterprises (associations) of every type of output as real social consumer value, the requirement to improve and increase the role of norms and standards in the administration of the "primary links" of the economy cannot fail, to a definite degree, to reveal the objective tendency of a buildup of the formal features in the process of reducing concrete labor to abstract. This manifests itself in a particular graphic manner in the evolution of the planned price. The latter, as has been repeatedly noted in the literature, while continuing to remain an expression of value, simultaneously begins, to a greater and greater degree, to play the role of the differentiated standard for the expenditures of live and embodied labor, which standard has been imputed in a planned manner to the enterprise (association). But that means that the general direction that is already "traceable" today in the improvement of price determination is the conversion of prices from the intermediated form of the expression of the socially necessary expenditures of labor that have been objectified in value, into a direct form of expressing the socially necessary expenditures of "labor of identical quality, in directly-socialized socialist production."

The increase in the maturity of the directly-socialized labor on the scale of the national economy and, correspondingly, the dying out of abstract labor are a prolonged and complicated process, and a matter of the long-term historical future. This, in the final analysis, was predetermined by the qualitative difference in the material-technical base of developed socialism and complete communism from the point of view of technical-technological socialization. In this regard it is important to note that abstract labor that is dying out is by no means equivalent to that which has died out. Constituting the real aspect of the system of production relations of socialism, the side that reflects the existing level of development of the social nature of its productive forces, abstract labor cannot be ignored either in theory or in the actual practice of management. On the contrary, planned administration has been called upon (on the base of a comparative analysis of the levels of technical-technological socialization that have been achieved in the various branches, types of production entities, and regions) to work out the forms of using the phenomenon of the bifurcation of labor into concrete and abstract for the purpose of encouraging an increase in productivity and improvement in the quality of the work performed by the collectives at enterprises and associations.

In this use one can isolate two features that supplement one another. On the one hand, the creation of a certain minimum of more or less "normal" conditions of carrying out the process of reducing concrete labor to abstract. This pertains primarily to those branches, types of production entities, and regions where the relatively low level of technical-technological socialization (the existence of enterprises that are small-scale, technically backward, that have not been included rigidly into a single branch or interbranch technological cycle) objectively limits the capabilities of the centralized-social regulation of the output of all consumer values and each of them. One must also include among these conditions first of all the elimination of the detailed regulation of the cost-accountability of the "primary links," the granting to the latter of real rights to determine independently certain substantial parameters of production: to plan a specific products list and variety of output to be produce and to select contracting parties for developing relations, to carry out within certain limits an independent investment policy ("self-financing") and to establish prices. Obviously, we must also consider the necessity to supplement the centralized material-technical supplying of wholesale trade with means of production. A number of such conditions have been stipulated by the decree of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers, entitled "Additional Measures for Expanding the Rights of Production Associations (Enterprises) of Industry in Planning and in Economic Activity, and for Intensifying Their Responsibility for the Results of Their Work," in execution of which, at the present time, our country has been carrying out an extensive, large-scale economic experiment. On the other hand, it is necessary to improve the work of the agencies of centralized administration with regard to neutralizing the objectively inevitable negative, spontaneous consequences of the process of reducing concrete labor to abstract. What would seem to be mandatory here is financial and other assistance to the enterprises and associations that are under objectively worse branch (natural and economic) conditions which

abstract labor, as an "averaged" expenditure of labor of identical quality "does not take into consideration." And conversely, it is necessary to "withdraw" that part of the net income of the enterprises and associations that are under objectively better conditions, which part is not the results of the expenditures of labor by their collectives, but, rather, spontaneously "catches" the labor expenditures of the collective in the group of economic units that was first mentioned. The elimination of the hidden redistribution of work time that is immanent to the process of reducing concrete labor to abstract must be supplemented by measures to discontinue the attempts that arise on the part of the enterprises that are commodity producers to violate planning and technological discipline, shipment discipline, attempts to inflate the price estimates unjustifiably, to ignore the established standards, etc.

The existence of negative phenomena which are substantially linked with the functioning of the relations of real commodity production attests to the exceptional importance, when achieving the practical mastery of the phenomenon of reducing concrete labor to abstract, of precisely knowing the degree to which that process is objectively influenced, the importance of seeing its fundamental historical prospect. In other words, the economic policy of the socialist state cannot artificially intensify the elements -- objectively influenced by the relative imperfection of technical-technological socialization -- of the contradiction between the directly-isolated and hidden-social labor performed by the collectives of enterprises and associations. Otherwise there arises the risk of undermining the initial economic realization of nationwide ownership -- the planned organization of social production as a whole. It is not accidental that one heard from the rostrum of the November 1982 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee words concerning the necessity, during the practical realization of the task of expanding the independence of economic units, to act "in a circumspect manner, to carry out experiments if necessary, and also to weigh and take into consideration the experience of the fraternal countries. The expansion of the independence must in all instances be combined with an increase in responsibility and with concern for the nationwide interests."

It is from these position, in our opinion, that it is necessary to evaluate the opinions according to which the improvement of the economic mechanism under present-day condition requires the complete and unlimited development of commodity-monetary relations. As applicable to the problem of abstract labor that is being considered, one cannot fail to note the following with regard to concepts of this type.

If one has in mind the reduction of the concrete labor performed by enterprise and association collectives to "labor of identical quality in directly-socialized production" (to labor on which there is only a reflection from the real abstract labor that "intertwines" with it, by the simple form of the latter), then the process of this reduce must actually be developed without any limitations. Since this economic policy is based upon the objective tendency of increase in the maturity of the directly-social nature of the labor performed by the production collectives, upon the real development of that aspect of the cost-accountability relations between those collectives and society, which aspect is regulated by a principle that is immanent to



socialism -- the principle of the specific, equivalent labor exchange. But the activity of the socialist state in intensifying the process of reducing concrete labor to true abstract labor (which activity is possible exclusively on the basis of the creation of conditions for the development of "elements of the isolation" of enterprises and associations in the direction of their "complete isolation") cannot fail to have strictly defined boundaries, the intersection of which causes an increase in the real danger of the evolution of socialism in the direction of "cooperative," anarcho-syndicalist socialism, the danger of converting the national economy into a system of "atomized" production units that are economically linked exclusively by the market. It would seem that one of the most vitally important tasks of political economics in generalizing the concrete experience of the reforms of the economic mechanisms of the socialist countries consists in the refining of these boundaries.

The theoretical differentiation of the expenditures that are closely "intertwined" in real economic life -- the expenditures of "labor of identical quality in directly-socialized socialist production" and of abstract labor -- would appear to be of no small importance for making practical use of the value indicators of the activity of production units. The dual and contradictory nature of these indicators -- the acting as the expression of the expression both of really abstract labor (and, consequently, real value), and of formally abstract labor, and, in essence, "labor of identical quality in directly-socialized production" (and, consequently, formal value) -- precludes taking an identical attitude to them.

For example, if one speaks of profit, then, in this aspect of cost-accountability relations of society and the collective, in which aspect the directly-social labor is being realized, the profit acts only formally as a value category (it only carries a "reflected" value form), but in essence is the difference between the standard that has been established by society for the expenditures of live and embodied labor per unit of actual social consumer value and the actual level of those expenditures at the particular enterprise. Consequently, the use of the profit indicator, provided society has assigned all the qualitative-quantitative parameters for the concrete labor (and, necessarily, those dealing with the products list and variety) and provided that there is price determination that is oriented on the socially necessary extent of the expenditures of labor of identical quality in directly-socialized production (price determination that evolves from the compensation of the planned expenditures which, in a differentiated manner, take into consideration the economic and natural conditions that the economic units in the branch find themselves in) serves as an economic method that is immanent to socialism -- the method of centralized management. And inasmuch as the extent of the profit acts for the collective as an incentive for economizing live and embodied labor for the entire mass and for every unit of directly-social consumer value, this method makes it possible simultaneously to mobilize that form of the collective's independence which, while being unconnected with the real economic isolation of the latter, is also immanent to socialism and requires all kinds of development. We have in mind the independence of the actions of production collectives in reducing the assets-, materials-, and labor-intensity of the output that is to be produced in accordance with a precise social "production order."



But with regard to the second aspect of the cost-accountability relation between the labor collective and society, which aspect contains elements of the isolation of the collective and, correspondingly, a real process of reducing concrete labor to abstract and the objectifying of the latter in value, one cannot fail to note the following: profit here acts as a real commodity relation (at the basis of which lies the difference between social and individual value), as the actual goal of managing the enterprise that is the commodity producer. The application of the profit indicator in the presence of the real isolation of the economic activity of enterprises and associations is one of the forms of using the bifurcation of labor into concrete and truly abstract. This application is objectively influenced in the branches and the types of production with a relatively low level of technical-technological socialization. However, it is potentially fraught with the previously noted negative phenomena (which, not infrequently, are realized in the practical situation) and also has objective boundaries.

The fundamental conclusions that were made in the decree of the CPSU Central Committee, entitled "Increasing the Role of the Institute of Economics, of USSR Academy of Sciences, in Elaborating the Key Questions of the Economic Theory of Developed Socialism," concerning the lag in the elaboration of the methodological problems of political economics and the fact that the gap between that science and the practice of management has not yet been completely overcome, pertains not least of all to the present state of research on the commodity-monetary relations in the system of socialist production that has been organized in a planned manner. Among the causes of the low rate of results in this research one can note, in our opinion, the fact that their authors frequently ignore the problem of the nature and specific peculiarities of abstract labor under socialism. The "intensification" of the study of this problem, which would be inconceivable without a thorough assimilation and creative application of the concept of abstract labor that was developed in the works of Marx, seems to be one of the important directions in the development of the theory of political economics, which has been called upon to serve as a factor for putting the economic mechanism into conformity with the requirements of the initial stage of mature socialist society.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1984.

5075

CSO: 1802/5

WITH THE PARTY, THE PEOPLE AND THE COUNTRY IN MIND AND HEART

AU201231 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 1984 (signed to press 21 Nov 84) pp 70-81

[Text] The questions of culture, ideology and spiritual development occupy a key place in the multifaceted creative activity of the party and the people in perfecting the socialist society that has been built in our country.

And this is absolutely natural. The CPSU has always proceeded and continues to proceed from the view that the new collectivist system cannot fully assert itself and successfully advance to ever higher levels of maturity and toward achieving the social equality of people without building a cultural basis, in the broadest sense of this word, that is appropriate for it. As early as in the very first days of the Soviet power, V. I. Lenin emphasized that we cannot build the life of the communist society without science, technology, knowledge and the arts ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 38, p 55). As a matter of fact, a number of fundamental features and advantages of socialism, as the first stage of the formation of communism--in the economy, social class and national relations, politics and the tenor of life of people--only fully manifests itself at the appropriate level of the development of culture. The cultural policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state has been based and continues to be based on these Leninist ideas. Historical practice confirms that ignoring or underrating the tasks of cultural revolution as an inseparable component part of socialist construction is fraught with serious difficulties and deformations.

Any kind of belittling of the significance of the superstructural factors of social progress is alien to creative Marxism-Leninism to which our party is steadfastly loyal. And these factors assume special importance under the conditions of the socialist society, the very nature of which is based on the principle of planning and organization and not on the principle of spontaneity. The idea that runs like a red line through the recent party documents is that, in any sphere of work and social life, we can advance only if our activities are based on thorough knowledge, high awareness and culture of all working people and if the enormous spiritual and creative potential accumulated by generations of Soviet people is brought into play. The decisions of the 26th Party Congress and the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums are aimed at mobilizing this potential. And, of course, they are not only aimed at ensuring a maximum and full utilization of this potential for

the fulfillment of the new creative tasks arising before our society, but also at multiplying it.

A significant growth of the social and spiritual activeness of the Soviet people is a distinct characteristic of our period. The collective ideological-theoretical activity of the party of communists that has been actively developed since the 26th CPSU Congress is a powerful generator of creative energy. It has enriched the science and practice of socialist construction with innovative ideas and important generalizations and conclusions of principle and has armed the masses with a clear understanding of the tasks and prospects of the country's development. This has given a powerful impulse to social consciousness and has noticeably affected the entire spiritual life of the Soviet people. And the signs of a spiritual upsurge are noticeable everywhere.

The new tidal wave in literature and the arts that was discussed in the Central Committee's Accountability Report submitted to the 26th CPSU Congress also brought with it much that is interesting, fresh and significant. Our literature and arts have responded with sensitivity to the profound and beneficial changes in Soviet society. And at the same time, they have increased their influence on the formation of the spiritual needs of the people and on the ideological-moral character of people.

The party welcomes and supports this positive process. It regards literature and the arts as a great force for forming the socialist individual personality, for consolidating the collectivist foundations of the Soviet way of life and for the moral and patriotic tempering of our youth. The speech by Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, at the jubilee plenum of the Board of the USSR Union of Writers, is permeated with the Leninist concern for the further flourishing of our culture and for increasing the social significance of literature and the arts. The speech evoked a wide response among the Soviet and world public and represented a major event in our country's political and cultural life.

"The jubilee plenum was held at the time of a new ascending spiral in the development of our society and our culture," V. Kozhevnikov, a well-known Soviet writer and Hero of Socialist Labor, said after the plenum. "And the speech by Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko was received with such enthusiasm by us writers because it reflected the grandioseness and complexity of this new period. Konstantin Ustinovich uncovered before us the enormous scope of the realities and prospects of society and the general directions and the supreme historical importance of the party program, on the one hand, and, at the same time, very finely analyzed the specific nature of artistic creativity, on the other."

In his speech Comrade K. U. Chernenko reviewed the cardinal problems of the development of Soviet culture. All workers of the Soviet artistic culture have received the speech as a wise instruction of the party and as an encouraging stimulus for attaining new peaks of creativity. I. Gorbachev, participant in the plenum jubilee and people's artist, expressed well the unanimous view of all Soviet cultural workers: "We have heard the word of the

party, which will become the program of activities not only of the writers organization but also of all creative organizations and institutions of culture and the arts."

Comrade K. U. Chernenko's speech and the ideas and principles expressed by him represent a continuation and development of the Leninist ideas and a brilliant new embodiment of the Leninist principles of cultural policy by which our party has invariably been guided and continues to be guided. That is, precisely of those precepts and principles that were determined by the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers, which was of historic importance for our entire multinational socialist culture.

The press chronicle brought this noteworthy fact to us under the dateline of Moscow, the fall of 1918. The festive concert on the occasion of the first anniversary of the October Revolution is in progress in the building of the workers' literary and arts circle. The concert turns into an improvised meeting when it is announced that Vladimir I'lich Lenin is present in the hall. He delivers a speech and speaks about the tasks of building a new culture and about the fact that the powerful organizing instrument, the arts, formerly monopolized by the bourgeoisie, is now in the hands of the proletariat and that only now is the proletariat able to create freely and with joy. Even in those days, when the old world threw all of its forces against the young Soviet republic and when the bourgeois intelligentsia refused to accept the power of workers and peasants, Lenin clearly saw the main road of the rising socialist culture. The road that led to the First Congress of Soviet Writers; the road that our culture steadfastly follows even today.

To see so far ahead it was necessary to stand tall. It was only possible to see the future from the height of Leninism, from the height to which the theory and practice of scientific socialism were raised by Lenin's genius and the activity of our party. History has demonstrated that only the bolsheviks were able to work out a consistent Marxist and truly proletarian program in the sphere of culture. They were able to reveal and realize the powerful potential of Marxism as the ideological credo of the rising class delivering the entire mankind and as the most influential and fruitful ideological current in the entire history of world civilization. Our party's program in the sphere of culture signified a resolute break both with the capitulating position of the Second International reformists who proclaimed culture, world outlook and religion as a "private affair" that has no relation to politics, and thereby perpetuated the domination of the bourgeois ideology over the working people, as well as with the dogmatic-sectarianist positions that nihilistically renounced cultural heritage.

In his concluding speech at the First Congress of Writers M. Gorkiy appraised the congress as a victory of the bolsheviks. And it really was a great victory of the communists. It was a victory in the sphere where the struggle was especially difficult and the forms of the struggle were diverse and multifaceted and where the inertia of the past and the individualistic vestiges were the strongest and most alive. The congress was a shining evidence of historical success of the bold initiative of the bolsheviks, which was regarded with fear and hatred by the ideological servants of the

bourgeoisie, a shining example of the introduction of the Communist Party attitude and organization into the sphere of cultural creativity and of organizing this creativity under the leadership of the workers class and its vanguard as a component part of the all-party and all-people's cause.

Bolshevism's victory at the congress was a victory of the party in the struggle for the creative intelligentsia. It was not an easy struggle and by no means an idyllic one: it demanded of communists endurance and persistence, tact and a principled attitude. The party firmly followed the Leninist course, drawing the intelligentsia to the creative work of the Soviet power, supporting the talented young people arriving from the fronts of the civil war and socialist reconstruction and from among workers and peasants to become "engaged in arts," and concerning itself with the cultural enlightenment of the broadest masses.

The resolution of the 13th Congress of the Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) "On the Press," the Central Committee's historic decision "On the Party Policy in the Sphere of Belletristic Literature" adopted on 18 June 1925 and the Central Committee's resolution "On Restructuring the Literary and Arts Organization" adopted on 23 April 1932--these are the main landmarks in the enormous work accomplished by the Bolshevik-Leninists in uniting the literary forces and ensuring a healthy and comradely atmosphere in the community of creative workers. These are the landmarks in the stages of the formation of literature reaching great heights, of the literature with a new socialist orientation. The careful preparations for and the successful development of the First Congress of Writers signified that the most important task formulated in the April resolution of the Central Committee was fulfilled, that is, the task of "uniting all writers who support the platform of the Soviet authority and aspire to participate in the socialist construction, in a single union of Soviet writers."

The significance of the writers congress for the fate of Soviet culture was in the fact that it also paved the way for the organizational cohesion of representatives of other detachments of artistic intelligentsia. The form of organization of literary workers, found after a long search and confirmed by the congress, was accepted as their tool by masters of other arts. And it has passed the test of time. To recall once again the words spoken by Lenin in 1918, it opened up the scope for free and joyful creativity, for the flourishing of Soviet culture.

The consolidation of Soviet writers on a unified ideological-aesthetic platform and their recognition of socialist realism as the leading and main method of their creative work by no means led, as the enemies had predicted, to the impoverishment of our literature and to the loss of some colors in its spectrum. On the contrary, prerequisites were created to ensure that the sources of its aesthetic wealth and individuality would begin to pulsate even more liberally and strongly and that the talent of each individual people would show even more fully and vividly in the arts of the words. The method of socialist realism was not born in any reasoning of doctrinaires in their offices but in the tireless search of the artists striving to give a memorable description of and to correctly reflect the formation and consolidation of the new world. It grew from the struggle for the new literature and the new arts

that are really free and openly linked to the working people. S. Eyzenshteyn expressed well for what and on behalf of what the struggle was being waged when he said "for the purity of methods, for the correctness of principles, and for the impermissibility of thrusts into formalism or of descent into unprincipled naturalism. And first and foremost for a high ideological attitude and for truthfulness that is inseparable from it...and for an uncompromising principled ideological attitude" (S. M. Eyzenshteyn, "Selected Articles." Moscow, 1956, p 77). It is precisely as a result of these achievements of the arts of socialist realism, that these arts have risen to the height of their best and truly classic achievements.

Precisely these achievements have given our Soviet literature a unique form, the literature that has traversed a great and glorious road since the first congress. This is the form that Comrade K. U. Chernenko so correctly characterized: "This is the literature that lives one life with the people, party and country. In its pages the majestic figures of Lenin and his comrades-in-arms, of the heroes of the civil war and the first five-year plans, and of the immortal soldiers of the Great Patriotic War rise to their full size. This is the literature at the center of which stands the man of work and the man at work, the inquisitive, seeking, working and active builder of socialism. This is the literature that is able to understand and portray its contemporary in the entire complexity of his inner world and moral search, in his joys and worries, in his aspirations for truth and justice. The work so remarkably begun by Gorkiy and Mayakovskiy, Fadeyev and Sholokhov is continued today by writers and poets who actively and fruitfully work in our multinational literature."

The Soviet country's cultural life is rich and multifaceted, intensive and sonorous and the literature's contribution to it is enormous. True to the principles of party spirit and national character, our writers, poets and playwrights carry out their creative work along a wide front and with the epic sweep an attention to the "people's thinking" that are organically inherent in the Soviet literature. Confirming its high reputation as one of the leading world literatures, Soviet literature is steadily rising to a new level of artistic mastery of the socialist reality in all of its multifaceted nature. The best of these works appearing today in the range of reading by Soviet people and entering the circle of their thoughts and feelings are distinguished by the breadth of their ideological perspective and by the penetrating insight into the "dialectic of the soul" of their heroes, by the humanist enthusiasm and high conscientiousness. Precisely the works of this kind become good companions on the road of life for millions of people in our country and abroad."

The panorama of Soviet literature created in many scores of languages was presented in the report by G. Markov, first secretary of the Board of the USSR Union of Writers, at the jubilee plenum of the board, and in the speeches by the plenum's participants. "...It can be confidently stated," G. Markov pointed out, "that the USSR Union of Writers is an offspring of the socialist revolution, an expression of its strength and depth in the spiritual sphere of human existence, a proof of the high ability of the Communist Party to unit the artistic intelligentsia around itself, imbue it with the enthusiasm of the

liberation struggle of the workers class and attract it with the magnitude of the tasks of building the communist society in our country."

The cohesion of our creative intelligentsia around its own communist party is indestructible, the cohesion around the party that shows its Leninist care for creating the conditions for the further development of literature and arts and for the creative growth of every individual artist. And the masters of Soviet culture are filled with the aspiration to fulfill the lofty tasks which the party placed before them and to produce works that are worthy of our time. V. Sidorov, RSFSR people's artist, has clearly expressed that businesslike and active frame of mind which the plenum of writers evoked in the community of creative workers: "K. U. Chernenko's speech is even more in tune with the time because it calls upon us to turn our faces to all the problems and to all the difficulties that stand on the road of spiritual comprehension of every individual. And it is necessary to work without any idling." And the field for the contribution of forces and abilities and for working for the glory of the fatherland and for the good of the people is opening up today before the artistic intelligentsia very widely and beneficially.

Building and perfecting socialism does not just mean building modern industrial plants and electric power plants and beautifying our land, our villages and cities. In transforming people's living conditions, it is necessary simultaneously to spare no effort for their ideological-moral elevation. And the tasks of perfecting real socialism cannot be managed without a great amount of work for the spiritual development of people and their socialist education.

And this is understandable because, as B. Brecht has correctly noted, in the final analysis all forms of art serve the greatest of them all, the art of living on earth. That is, if we continue this idea, living worthily, according to the laws of collectivism and justice, and according to the high moral norms of the builders of the new society. Not every book or film and not every theater piece or painting rises to the level of this service and helps the man in practice to assert himself in life, assume a correct and active position, withstand life's trials and traverse his road with his head held high.

But to create the works that will be remembered by the people and will win their love and recognition, the artist must meet the main requirement placed on him and his works by the party and the people. A profound ideological conviction, civic consciousness, and a high standard of artistic skill, this is what must characterize his works. The experience of world arts, and primarily in the 20th century, shows what immense artistic and aesthetic energy is hidden in profound philosophical thinking, moral purposefulness and political activeness, that is, in what is generally accepted as an ideological orientation of creative work, the party character of the artist's position. However, in order to release this energy it is necessary to have real talent, a strong creative will and a confident use of the secrets of skill. It is only under these conditions that it is possible to achieve a synthesis of the communist ideological conviction and innovative artistic approach that are so strongly reflected in the works of the classics of Soviet literature and arts.



The traditions founded by them live and are being enriched and are interpreted through the prism of the contemporary attitudes of people, contemporary aesthetic thinking and the contemporary spiritual demands. Many examples can be listed to show how fruitful the results can be when the arts address themselves to the problems of political, ideological and world outlook that had previously been considered by some as being beyond the strength of the arts. And, of course, in this connection it is necessary to take into account the fact that the dialectical interdependence of the arts and politics, of world outlook and talent and the ideological conviction and skill--like any dialectical interdependence--does not lend itself to simplified and mechanical interpretation. Can anyone today really doubt the enormous importance of talent and skill in the sphere of the arts, where anything that is dull, a hack work, or mediocre cannot live, does not work out, and simply falls outside the field of arts.

Naturally, there is something else that should not be forgotten. That is, that the most talented work of art will fail to attain its goals if it is not filled with profound ideas and closely related to the realities of our life and fails to indicate the road of advance. The party, too, counts on the active assistance of the masters of culture in the current major task of raising the consciousness of the masses and reorienting the social consciousness in order to enable it to more quickly adopt new ideas and more resolutely free itself from the obsolete and backward views. The arts can accomplish a great deal here asserting with their resources the very approach to life and its problems and the very high ideals which the party and the people are advocating.

That is, precisely the arts' own resources that are imminent only in the arts because there are essential differences between the arts and ideology and between the artistic and scientific-philosophical methods of interpreting the world. There are differences but there is no Great Wall of China between them. The wooden orthodoxy of the type advocated by the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers and denounced by the party, and the groundless attachments of ideological labels can bring to the arts nothing but harm. However, the attempts to deideologize the world outlook of artists and to give satisfaction to the omnivorousness of world outlook and to the ideological instability are no less harmful, no matter what considerations may be used to justify them. All this has been generally known and recognized since the time of the First Congress of Soviet Writers. Unfortunately, however, there are some who have begun to forget all this. Otherwise, where else could be the origin of the very questionable ways of some authors of opposing a "sacramental philosophical sovereignty" of arts to the "ideological-political platform" of the artist.

The question of the role of ideological-political and ideological elements in the creative process should on no account be treated lightly. The ideological content as understood by Marx, Engels and Lenin and as understood by our party has nothing in common with the mindless repetition of canonical theses or reliance on the magical force of once learned "general passages" that may or may not be appropriate. Accordingly, the ideological position of an artist and, generally, of any person professionally engaged in the arts, is by no means reduced, as it were, to ideological loyalty and a yes-man attitude that

binds one to nothing. As K. U. Chernenko has said, "Our great cause and our humanist goals do not need any heartless glorification in verse or prose. The works in which, as Shchedrin has perspicaciously noted, 'a cold chewing-over of alphabetical truths' is used as a substitute for fresh ideas can only be called artistic in mocking them. Badly written books or operas, primitively produced television or feature films, and crudely made sculptures or paintings do not simply corrupt the taste of millions of people. They discredit the topics and ideas which the creators of these works use. It is therefore necessary to struggle persistently and in a principled manner against dullness and facelessness in arts."

It is in his creative work itself and not beyond it where the ideological nature of the artist and his ability to fight with his creative activity for our noble principles and our humanist goals must manifest themselves. It is appropriate in this connection to recall the words of Lenin, pronounced with reference to politics and applying also to the sphere of arts: "...The communist principles and ideals are good, but, well, they are presented in a way that you, good people, are asking for paradise in your life--but do you know how to go about your work?" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 45, p 79).

Giving an answer to this question today does not mean, of course, waiving communist principles and noble ideals. Quite the opposite. Today our society is particularly sensitive and receptive to discussion of these principles and ideals, because it has set itself the task of bringing all aspects of its life in line with the socialist ideal and with the highest, scientifically substantiated norms of socialism. Literature and art have done and are doing a very great deal to reveal the vast attractive force, vitality and social justice of our ideal. It is good that our writers, critics and specialists in literature devote great attention to that heroic struggle for the socialist ideal which was waged by progressive social thinking in Russia, as well as to the dramatic peripeteia and reflection of this struggle in literature itself. And, of course, to the significance of the Leninist stage in the development of the theory and practice of scientific socialism. This is a very effective means of propagandizing the socialist ideal and of showing its moral-philosophical greatness and fascination and its comprehensive validity. In this respect it is necessary to rebuff persisting attempts to revive neopopulist views and to combine the incompatible--scientific socialism and a religiously embellished patriarchal utopia.

Human relations in production and in everyday life, the spiritual world of the individual, and the individual's place in our trouble world--all this is an inexhaustible sphere of artistic search and discovery. But these discoveries are made when the talented artist turns to people who live the concerns of their country and their people and whose lives are filled with intensive work and persistent struggle for the triumph of justice and good. The party highly appraises the work of figures in Soviet culture who create true, full-blooded characters in whom we can perceive the salt of our earth and who embody everything that is good and dear to us in the Soviet nature. Every epoch and every stage of socialist creativity has had its heroes, and, in this sense, today is no exception. It is natural that art seeks new ways of portraying the character of our contemporaries and that it fulfills this key creative task by different artistic means from before.

Any external adhering to norms and cliches can only cause harm here. Art is not made by following recipes, even the best--this is what makes it art. The artist's cause lies in selecting the initial vital material for his work and determining in what form he will present it. But, as artistic practice shows, it is difficult for an author to rely upon success if his works dramatize shortcomings and importunately place only vital disorders and unstrung, whining characters in the foreground, or if he permits the varnishing of reality and departure from the truth of life and people's real concerns. It is not at all a question of establishing some kind of thematic table of ranks, having divided subjects into the acceptable and unacceptable. It is a question of the damage done to creativity by petty themes, ideological cachexia, and loss of the ability to differentiate between the great and the small, the typical and the individual, and the constant and the fluctuating and to perceive the whole, that great "hierarchy of subjects" referred to by L. Tolstoy on the basis of the creative experience of A. Pushkin (L. N. Tolstoy, "Complete Collected Works," in 90 volumes, vol 62, Moscow, 1953, p 22). And it is this ability that, to a considerable extent, makes an artist an artist.

"Our strength," noted Lenin, "is in the statement of truth" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 11, p 326). And the party has always valued and supported truthful, bold, civically active art that really deals with problems. Like the most precise of seismographs, Soviet literature and art have caught and presented for trial by the public nature, sometimes very serious problems of our life and contradictions of our development. And not only caught and presented them for trial, but also actively helped the party and the people to resolve these problems and contradictions. The CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Creative Ties between Literary-Artistic Journals and the Practice of Communist Construction" notes that articles and essays published in the organs of the press on the positive experience of management, on the problems of the social restructuring of rural areas, and on environmental protection have met with broad readers' interest. As is well known, decisions have been adopted by party and state organs on some of these issues.

Works by our leading cinematographers and television programmers have great significance for the awareness of the public, and not the least for economic workers, of the importance and scale of the ecological problem. The complex knot of problems connected with the development of Nechernozemye is the subject of constant attention on the part of a whole series of figures in culture. All this is in the aktiv of Soviet literature and art.

The fact that our masters of culture understand their place in the general system is a great achievement. This understanding shows the entire groundlessness of the opinion still current in some places that the cause of art is to pose problems and criticize society, while everything else supposedly does not concern it. Art is a great force, and its active help, assistance in all social affairs, and involvement in them are very important also for the reason that a new life, as is well-known, does not have an easy birth. And conflict between the new and the progressive, and the old and the obsolete, including our socialist "past," is never removed from the agenda. The very progress of Soviet society from one stage of development to the next

is a most complex process inevitably connected with the overcoming of difficulties, contradictions and conflicts. Such is the real picture of social progress and the struggle of the party and the people to establish good and social justice. As Lenin wrote, "the first duty of those who wish to seek 'ways to human happiness' is not to fool themselves and to have the courage to openly admit what actually is" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 1, p 407).

The courage of the artist...How is this to be interpreted today? A great deal is expatiated on this moral--and not only moral, but also aesthetic--subject by anti-Soviets, who strive to instill the idea by any means in the milieu of the artistic intelligentsia that courage consists exclusively in rocking the foundations, rejecting the existing system, and so forth. There are profound thoughts on this matter to be found in the creative legacy of the remarkable Soviet writer K. Fedin, thoughts which raze this subversive idea to the ground. "The courage of the Soviet writer, that is, of an artist who has developed with the growth of the new society and who belongs to this society in soul...", he wrote, "means nothing other than that natural state of profoundly honest and best possible work in his sphere of art, work which--each in his own sphere--is done by Soviet physicists aspiring to new discoveries, Soviet managers of large plants, Soviet geologists extracting oil at sea, Soviet pedagogues seeking new methods of educating children, doctors experimenting in laboratories, and so forth. Courage, if one is to interpret it as a claim to stand higher than social interests in the contemporary era...or as the impudence with which the conscious enemy of communism hinders the development of Soviet society and blackens it with slander--this kind of courage we, Soviet writers, not only do not wish to, but cannot remotely emulate" (VOPROSY LITERATURY, 1983, No 6, p 130).

And no one is promised creative laurels if he transgresses the fine line dividing the civic and aesthetic courage of the master of Soviet art, which is welcomed and supported by the party, from immaturity and presumption. As it was noted at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, we also come across examples where, having undertaken complex problems, an author either loses his head over them or tries to "flaunt" his "original" interpretation of these problems and, as a result, distorts our reality.

Particular scrupulousness and seriousness are essential in the treatment of subjects which the party and the Soviet people believe to be fundamentally important and pivotal to our art: Lenin, the revolution, socialist creativity and the working and military development of the Soviet people. Here any ideological slip is particularly intolerable. It is worrying that in some works deviations are permitted from historical truth, such as in the appraisal of collectivization, for example, as well as concessions to various kinds of national prejudices.

In the same way, any kind of hack work, superficiality of approach and plagiarism and stereotypicality in artistic solutions is also intolerable. It is really a question of what is dear and sacred to every Soviet individual and of our socialist primogeniture. It is inadmissible to discuss this in a trite fashion. It is all the more inadmissible in view of the fact that there are fine examples of the truly artistic embodiment of these subjects to be found

in our literature and art today. It is these examples that should be emulated.

Our literary, theatrical and sculptural Leniniana has been added to in recent years, for example, by new, brilliant works. The films "Karl Marx. The Young Years" (directed by L. Kulidzhanov) and "Lenin in Paris" (directed by S. Yutkevich) have aroused great interest among viewers in the country and abroad. The series "Ardent Revolutionaries," within the framework of which a considerable number of talented books have been published, a series released by the Publishing House of Political Literature, enjoys great prestige among readers.

Creative success has gladdened those writers working in the now popular genre of the historical novel. Cinematographers, painters and figures in the theater have good examples of the artistic elaboration of many pages from the rich historical past of the peoples of our country to their credit. This process of deepening the historical method of literature and art has great ideological, moral significance. The moral lessons of historical recollection and education through history are one of the most effective means of forming civic spirit and of introducing people, primarily young people, to the values of Soviet patriotism.

It is important that patriotism should be correctly and effectively utilized also for the reason that one of the main aspects of the subversive activities of "Sovietologists" and anticommunists today is the indiscriminate reinterpretation of the history of our motherland and slanderous speculations and conjectures concerning its historical path and role in world events. Their attempts to galvanize historio-sophistic, religious-mystic, and nationalist concepts developed by representatives of reactionary trends in prerevolutionary social thinking, 'emigre' circles, and "Eurasians" and to extol the names of K. Leontyev, Rozanov, Berdyayev, Merezhkovskiy and others drew attention to themselves. That is why today it is particularly important to be able to discuss the past seriously and with consideration and from the positions of a Marxist-Leninist world outlook, and to be able to offer well-argued opposition to all recurrences of a nonclass approach to the legacy of native and world culture.

An invaluable contribution to patriotic education is made by masters of Soviet culture who lend their strengths and talent to extolling the immortal feat of our people in the Great Patriotic War. Our patriotic awareness is impossible to imagine without the songs "Day of Victory" and "The Cranes," the movie epics "The Great Patriotic War" and "Our Biography," the memorial complexes in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and Riga, and a whole series of fine films on the last war. Many major achievements are connected with our "military prose," which is still one of the leading spheres in Soviet literature and is being reinforced with new names. And today, when the Soviet people are preparing to triumphantly mark the 40th anniversary of our victory in the Great Patriotic War, the party expresses its firm belief that Soviet masters of art will create new, fine works dedicated to military-patriotic themes which will become an event in the country's artistic life and in the development of Soviet literature and art.

Marxist-Leninist criticism, which the party regards as the main method and instrument in exerting an influence on artistic creativity, is one of the chief reserves of further enhancing the educational role of literature and art and raising their ideological-artistic level. The social activeness of criticism, its clear world outlook and ideological orientation, and its great professionalism determine to a considerable degree the general atmosphere in art and its ideological and moral tone. Guided by the Leninist instruction concerning the necessity to "connect literary criticism more closely with party work" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 47, p 134), the party devotes great attention to this sphere of literary-publicist work. The well-known CPSU Central Committee resolution on literary-artistic criticism has played a large role in this criticism being activated, in fresh, talented resources being drawn into it, and in its influence upon processes taking place in our culture being increased.

The profound philosophical treatment of the social vocation of literary-artistic criticism and the essence of today's party demands on it were expounded by Comrade K. U. Chernenko at the jubilee plenary meeting of the board of the USSR Union of Writers. "...Our native and world experience shows," he emphasized, "that great literature and art cannot exist without highly professional, civically responsible criticism. And this means that our Marxist-Leninist criticism must not only clearly evaluate given works. We expect more from artistic criticism. We expect the ability to reveal the deep social meaning of problems which are touched on in works, to support the authors if they pose these problems correctly and to present them with a sound argument when they err. In a word, our criticism must help the progress of the people's spiritual life."

In order to fulfill these high demands made by the party, criticism must restructure its work in many ways and overcome shortcomings which reduce its effectiveness. The level of philosophical content of critical works and their methodological standard must be seriously raised. Criticism is an indispensable component part of literature and of the complex organism of philology. But to say this of criticism means to say little. Criticism today is, if one can paraphrase its well-known definition, "moving Marxist-Leninist aesthetics," which is based on the foundation of scientific philosophy--dialectical and historical materialism.

To recall this once again is opportune, because not so long ago some authors propagandized the concept of criticism as called upon to be a "philosophy through the medium of literature itself." In its objective sense this apologia for something akin to the philosophical drift of literature led to a depreciation of the world outlook role of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Unfortunately, this concept, as well as similar ideas expressed in other works, was not given proper analysis and a well-defined appraisal in our press. How else can one explain, for example, the fact that in discussions on the philosophical positions of criticism and the "world outlook quests" of literature in one journal, the ancient Christian idea of "personal immortality" was put forward totally seriously as a "new spiral in humanist thinking"?



It is precisely this lack of world outlook discrimination and instability of aesthetic criteria that lead some critics to be touched by the "aesthetic finds" of ideologically flimsy works.

One of the tasks of criticism is to act as an objective reflection of the development of literature and art, to provide an integral picture of what is being done in our culture, and to appraise exactly and without making any allowances the works of both seasoned authors and those authors just beginning. In this respect it is very important that an example of a respective attitude to criticism should be set primarily by prominent, recognized masters of culture and by leading figures in the creative unions, and that they set the correct tone in this matter. One of the most unshakeable and chief traditions of a Marxist-Leninist, party approach to criticism is that of combining accuracy of ideological appraisal, depth of social analysis, and aesthetic exactingness with a careful attitude to talents and to fruitful creative search. It cannot be considered normal that sometimes criticism or impartial appraisal of a certain work of art takes the form of slating and entails, so to speak, organizational conclusions.

It must also be constantly borne in mind that our party regards talent as national property. Everyone whom the party has trusted to pursue a Leninist course in the sphere of art must do this sensibly and with initiative. And this means holding a frank and principled conversation with people of creative work. Not in any case avoiding serious problems troubling the artist. Not shifting the responsibility of resolving these problems onto so-called higher authorities, being able to convince and, if need be, reconvince one's interlocutor.

A matter of professional honor for our critics is to sharpen their ability to analyze the processes taking place in art and new artistic phenomena from class, Marxist-Leninist positions. Any other approach conceals the danger of manifestations of subjectivism, lack of objective criteria, group bias and a liberal attitude to ideological and artistic errors.

Our party and its Leninist Central Committee show constant concern for the Soviet creative intelligentsia, create favorable conditions for the activities of their unions and associations, and devote close attention to perfecting the work of their party organizations. The documents of the June 1983 Plenum, the CPSU Central Committee resolutions "On Creative Ties between Literary-Artistic Journals and the Practice of Communist Construction" and "On the Work of the Party Organization of the Belorussian Yanka Kupala State Academic Theater," the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers "On Measures To Further Raise the Ideological-Artistic Level of Cinema Films and To Strengthen the Material-Technical Base of Cinematography," and the speech by Comrade K. U. Chernenko at the jubilee plenary meeting of the board of the USSR Union of Writers have opened up broad, inspiring prospects for figures in Soviet culture and set them major tasks.

The conferring of the title Hero of Socialist Labor on a number of literary figures and the awarding of a large group of comrades with USSR orders for their services in the development of Soviet literature and in connection with



the 50th anniversary of the formation of the USSR Union of Writers was a stirring event in the country's cultural life.

The party has supported and will continue to support the creative unions and associations, regarding them as organizations of self-initiative of people who are truly creative, united by their service to the people, and imbued with a spirit of responsibility to them. Organizations alien to any parochial exclusivity, constantly concerned with the influx of fresh, talented forces and maintaining an atmosphere of ideological, moral and aesthetic exactingness. The communists working in these organizations act as the political core and cohesive strength of the creative unions. "They are called upon," emphasized Comrade K. U. Chernenko, "to consistently establish party spirit in the artistic milieu, actively influence the ideological direction of creativity, help to form a Marxist-Leninist world outlook in literary and artistic figures, and assist the formation of creative young people." the party is sure that the party organizations of the creative unions will expend every effort to raise their work to the level of these lofty tasks.

At the First Congress of Soviet Writers M. Gorkiy urged them to do everything to ensure "mutual and extensive familiarization with the cultures of fraternal republics." Both the USSR Union of Writers and other creative unions have really made a great contribution to developing and bringing closer in every possible way the cultures of all nations and nationalities in the country, and to increasing their contacts and mutual ties, which has also opened up the way to forming a unified international culture of the Soviet people. This culture absorbs everything of general significance in the achievements and original traditions of national cultures. The creative unions are called upon also henceforth to develop comprehensively the mutual exchange of spiritual values between the fraternal peoples of our country, concern themselves with correctly combining national and international principles in artistic creativity, orient the creative cadres toward all-union and world criteria and resolutely struggle against all manifestations of national arrogance and attempts to rehabilitate obsolete views and morals.

Having visited our country, the brilliant Chilean Pablo Neruda wrote: "I fell in love with the Soviet land at first sight; I not only felt that for all corners of human existence it is the source of morality and the progress of labor and distribution, but it also struck me that this steppe continent, so pure in its naturalness, will give birth to a great upward flight. All mankind knows that here originates a gigantic truth...."

In this "gigantic truth" about man and society, a truth which has been revealed by socialism, lies the irresistible attractive force of Soviet literature and art. Thanks to this truth they themselves are becoming for many of those who live under the terrible press of imperialist, anti-Soviet propaganda a road leading to understanding of our country and its role in today's trouble world, where a relentless struggle is being waged for the minds and hearts of billions of people. Revolutionary solidarity leads our cinematographers, publicists, writers and artists to the world's "hot spots," where a battle is in progress for the freedom of the peoples and for social justice. The party highly values the single-minded, active struggle waged by leading masters of our literature and art, to whose voice millions of people

listen in our country and abroad, against the nuclear threat looming over mankind and against that unbridled "psychological war" which imperialism has unleashed against the USSR and fraternal socialist countries.

Embodying the spiritual wealth of the new, socialist civilization, Soviet culture actively contributes to the cause of mutual understanding between peoples. Our literature and art honorably fulfill the role of herald of peace and friendship, and they carry the truth to the broad popular masses the world over, the truth about socialist society, its achievements and problems, its peaceful policies and the spiritual foundations and values upon which the socialist way of life is based.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/5

## PIONEER OF THE JAPANESE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84) pp 82-90

[Article by A. Senatorov]

[Text] The name Sen Katayama began to appear in the European and American socialist press at the turn of the century. His articles, written in Tokyo, describe the awakening of the class self-awareness of the proletariat and the spreading of socialist ideas in distant Japan, which had entered the path of fast capitalist development. In the summer of 1904, when Russian and Japanese families were receiving the sad news announcing the death of their fathers, sons and husbands at the fronts of the Russo-Japanese War, the courageous words of this person, who had stood up to the avalanche of chauvinism which had covered virtually all of Japan at that time, could be read in the Petersburg VESTNIK INOSTRANNOY LITERATURY: "We, Japanese socialists, oppose the war with Russia, for its only possible outcome is that thousands of unfortunate and ignorant working people will be slaughtered to satisfy the interests of the capitalist classes and rulers, will be the reason for making thousands of widows and orphans among the poorest class and will worsen its poverty even further" (VESTNIK INOSTRANNOY LITERATURY, St Petersburg, July 1904, p 316). A month later, the news was received that Katayama, who represented the Japanese socialists at the Amsterdam Congress of the Second International, had publicly shaken hands, in a deeply symbolic gesture, with G. V. Plekhanov, the RSDWP delegate, and had assured the participants in the congress that no persecution or difficulties would prevent him and his comrades from openly advocating world peace. Katayama ended his speech by swearing to "observe the slogan of Karl Marx, the great leader: 'Workers of the World, Unite!'" (quoted from D. I. Gol'dberg. "Ocherk Istorii Rabochego i Sotsialisticheskogo Dvizheniya v Yaponii (1868-1908 Gg.)" [Outline of the History of the Worker and Socialist Movement in Japan (1868-1908)]. Moscow, 1976, p 131).

However, Sen Katayama became truly world-known after joining the communist movement. His contribution to the Japanese and international proletariat was recognized in December 1922, when he was elected member of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International (IKKI). He held this position until the end of his life, systematically guided by the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and firmly observing the principles of proletarian internationalism.

The path which led Katayama to scientific socialism was not simple. It reflected all the features of the atmosphere in which he had to live and work.

Katayama was born 125 years ago, on 3 December 1859, in a small Japanese mountain village, to a peasant family, at a time when K. Marx was still fully justified in writing that "Japan, with its strictly feudal land ownership system and widespread petty peasant farming, offers a much more accurate picture of the European Middle Ages than all of our history books which are heavily imbued with bourgeois prejudices" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 23, p 729). It was during Katayama's childhood that Japan underwent the so-called "Meiji restoration," which had the nature of an incomplete bourgeois revolution. Under those circumstances, Katayama's first teachers were Shintoist and Buddhist preachers, who believed that their exclusive duty was to educate their students in a spirit of honoring and strictly obeying their superiors. Katayama did not even complete the full primary education course.

This period was followed by hard work in peasant fields and in a small printing press in Tokyo, and a constant search for a job which would allow him to pursue his studies at incredibly modest food and subsistence costs. Katayama experienced all of this in Japan and, as of 1884, for 12 years in the United States, where he went with a dream of finally acquiring a real university education. He attained his objective only through exceptional industriousness and purposefulness. He returned from the United States with university diplomas. No less important, however, was the fact that Katayama personally experienced the falsehood and hypocrisy of those who praised the classical bourgeois-American way of life.

During his years of study in the United States, Katayama became interested in the grave social problems which were exciting the public. He tried to find ways to resolve them. However, he had no possibility of making a thorough study of the foundations of scientific socialism. He returned to Japan imbued with the ideas of social Christianity and the burning desire to dedicate all his strength to eliminating the vices and injustices of bourgeois society which, on the one hand, led to the crying poverty of the toiling classes and, on the other, the enrichment and parasitism of the rich.

This was in 1896. Shortly before that, Japan had won its aggressive war against neighboring China. Still clinging to the numerous attributes and vestiges of a feudal system, Japan rushed into the ranks of the imperialist powers by participating fiercely in the predatory division and redivision of the world, based on military power. Meanwhile, however, a different process was developing as well: the growing Japanese proletariat was acquiring a class self-awareness and was beginning to rise to the struggle for its vital interests and for social liberation, by organizing and adopting a socialist outlook.

Katayama's subsequent life became inseparable from the process of the appearance and development of a worker and socialist and, subsequently, communist movement in that country. Furthermore, he played a pioneer role in that movement.

From 1897 to 1900 Katayama worked as organizer of the first Japanese trade unions, which took up the defense of the vital interests of the young working class. In 1897 he headed the publication of the first printed organ of the Japanese proletariat RODO SEKAI ("Worker World"), which taught the working people understanding of their class interests and how to rally in the struggle against capitalism. It is no accident that Katayama is frequently referred to as the "father of Japan's trade union movement."

Katayama stood at the origins of the socialist movement in Japan. He was among the first in the country to become familiar with Marxism and to disseminate its ideas. He worked most energetically to combine Marxist theory with the labor movement. With a handful of like-minded people, in 1901 Katayama made the first attempt ever in Japan to found a social democratic party which, in his mind, was to become the party of the working class.

The authorities in imperial Japan cruelly dealt with those who dared to question the country's order. Socialism was unable to establish a regularly functioning party. Repressions even led to the actual liquidation of the few trade unions. Katayama himself, as the organizer of the major strike launched by the Japanese street car conductors in 1912, was sent to jail. After his release, he was subject to strict police supervision, which not only excluded the possibility of engaging in political activities but actually deprived him and his family of the possibility of earning a living. He was forced to emigrate to the United States in 1914.

Major changes took place in Katayama's outlook here, although he had joined the labor movement as a Christian socialist and, subsequently, although mastering and applying a number of important Marxist concepts, was unable totally to surmount reformist illusions for a long time. He was the first among the Japanese socialists to adopt the positions of scientific socialism--Marxism-Leninism--definitively and completely.

During World War I, Katayama's first anti-imperialist views took him closer to the revolutionary wing of the American Socialist Party, which had adopted the internationalist platform of the Zimmerwald Left. Having experienced the hardships of peasant life, attended the school of hired labor, acquired rich experience through contacts with workers and learned through the practical experience of personal participation in the labor movement the inadmissibility of an agreement with the class enemy, Katayama realized that he could not follow the opportunistic leadership of the Second International. He warmly welcomed the Great October Socialist Revolution and unconditionally took the side the bolsheviks. He considered the victory of the October Revolution a turning point in the global revolutionary movement.

Katayama's familiarity with V. I. Lenin's writings, the outstanding work "The State and Revolution" in particular, was of great importance in determining his further progress in life. Thanks to the thorough study of this work, Katayama was to write later, he was able to understand the importance of the dictatorship of the proletariat and to realize the justice of the revolutionary principles of the Russian bolsheviks. Katayama translated this work into Japanese and insistently recommended to those who had decided to

dedicate themselves to the revolutionary struggle to study without fail and profoundly to master the concepts of the Leninist theory of the state and revolution. In a letter dated 24 August 1920, he wrote to a comrade in Japan: "My friend, the nature of the state became particularly clear to me quite recently, particularly after the revolution, and I would like to explain it to you. This is quite important in terms of our further work. At this point, we must immediately clarify the nature, origin and objectives of the state" (Sen Katayama, "Sobr. Soch." [Collected Works], in three volumes, in Japanese. Vol 2, Tokyo, 1960, p 337). Katayama described Lenin's work and explained that the capitalist state is replaced by a period of power of the workers--dictatorship of the proletariat--which sets up its own state ruled by the working class.

Forced to remain in America even after an upsurge in the worker and peasant movement broke out in Japan under the influence of the revolutionary events in Russia, and after the "rice rebellions" had shaken up the country in the autumn of 1918, displaying the power of the anger and discontent of the toiling masses with the existing system, Katayama deemed it his duty above all to organize contacts among the scattered groups of Japanese socialists and the Communist International. Katayama described the Comintern Manifesto, which was adopted at the first Comintern Congress, as the most valuable document which opened "a new era in the history of the socialist movement." He organized its translation and publication in the Japanese language.

At the same time, Katayama engaged in comprehensive literary, propaganda and organizational activities in the U.S. labor movement. He supported the unification of the American Communists within a single communist party. In 1921 he carried out an important Comintern assignment in helping preparations for the first congress of the Communist Party of Mexico.

Although becoming increasingly involved in the international communist movement, Katayama did not forget his homeland. He was pleased by the upsurge of the labor movement in Japan and formulated the task of founding a communist party in that country: "Imperialism in any country must be crushed directly by the proletariat of that same country; this proletariat must struggle under the leadership of the communist party, relying on the Communist International" (Sen Katayama, "Stat'i i Memuary" [Articles and Memoirs], Moscow, 1959, p 56).

In December 1921 Katayama went to Moscow in order to assist, with Comintern support, the fastest possible founding of a Marxist-Leninist party in Japan. The participation of the Japanese delegation in the First Congress of Revolutionary Organizations of the Far East, at the beginning of 1922, in the preparations for and holding of which Katayama played an important role, was a decisive step in that direction.

Alongside envoys of communist and national-revolutionary organizations of China, Korea, Mongolia and the Dutch Indies (today's Indonesia), the representatives of Japan discussed in a free and democratic environment the status, tasks and prospects of the liberation struggle in their countries and problems of strengthening the cohesion among communist and national liberation movements in Far Eastern countries. Meetings with noted Comintern leaders, who held broad views and relied on the experience of revolutionary battles of



the global proletariat, the experience of the victorious revolution in particular, helped the participants in the congress to go beyond the limited experience of their own still-small and splintered organizations in which a great variety of ideological trends coexisted and clashed. The participants in the congress were exceptionally inspired by their meeting with Lenin in his Kremlin office. This meeting particularly contributed to strengthening the spirit of internationalism which imbued the entire proceedings of the congress of Far Eastern revolutionary organizations. Lenin emphasized the need to rally the revolutionary forces of all countries represented at the congress. He highly appreciated the stand taken by Katayama, known to Lenin for his firm condemnation of Japanese imperialism and appeals for solidarity between the Japanese working class and the working people in countries which had become targets of Japanese expansionism. Addressing himself to Katayama, Lenin said: "You defended the United Front in the Far Eastern countries" ("Vospominaniya o Vladimire Il'iche Lenine" [Recollections About Vladimir Il'ich Lenin]. In five volumes. Vol 5, Moscow, 1979, p 438).

A rapprochement in the views held by the representatives of the different Japanese organizations took place during the congress. Those who described themselves initially as anarcho-communists and sindicalists accepted the Comintern principles. The Japanese delegation reached the conclusion that no single revolutionary organization which existed in Japan at that time would be able alone to rally the progressive elements of the Japanese proletariat and unite the broad toiling masses. On behalf of the delegation, Katayama reported to the congress that an agreement had been reached to create a strong and united communist party in Japan. The political platform of the future party was drafted and adopted as well.

Several months later, the founding of the Communist Party of Japan was proclaimed at a clandestine constituent congress held in Tokyo on 15 July 1922. The way to Japan was closed to Katayama and the congress took place without his participation. However, it implemented the task which Katayama had formulated and set to the Japanese revolutionaries. The Japanese communists highly appreciate Katayama's contribution to the founding of the CPJ. The participation of the Japanese delegation in the First Congress of Revolutionary Organizations of the Far East and the assistance provided by the Comintern and Katayama, we read in the book "60 Let Kompartii Yaponii," [60 Years of Japanese Communist Party], "played an important role in accelerating the founding of the Japanese Communist Party" ("60 Let Kompartii Yaponii" in Japanese. Tokyo, 1982, pp 23-24).

It was with Katayama's direct participation that the Comintern Commission on the Japanese Problem also formulated the draft program for the CPJ and defined the immediate requirements which the party should formulate in accordance with the specific situation in Japan.

Subsequently as well, Katayama remained a concerned tutor of Japan's communists. He thoroughly studied the situation of the party and its policies of the mass movements and indicated the proper line of action to his comrades, who were by no means always able to rise above daily concerns and objectively to assess the real situation and the prospects of the struggle.

When the CPJ resolved to disband the party, as a result of the mass detentions and savage terror unleashed against communists and sympathizing public figures, in June and in the autumn of 1923, Katayama firmly condemned such liquidationist feelings. "With the support of the Comintern and Katayama," recalls S. Nosaka, a veteran of the Japanese communist movement, "we adopted a profoundly self-critical approach to the error and soon afterwards engaged in active efforts to rebuild the party" ((DZEN"EEY), No 3, 1978, p 291).

Together with representatives of the CPJ, Katayama participated in the Comintern's drafting of the "Theses on the Japanese Problem" in 1927 and "On the Situation in Japan and the Tasks of the Communist Party of Japan" in 1932. The 1927 Comintern recommendations helped the Japanese communists to reject once and for all their liquidationist feelings, to surmount right-wing opportunistic deviationism and to reject left-wing opportunistic and sectarian trends. The 1927 theses are considered by the Communist Party of Japan as its first programmatic document officially accepted and approved by the party. "The strategy, tactics and course of party construction they earmark were a major manual for action in building a vanguard party and developing the revolutionary movement in our country" ("60 Let Kompartii Yaponii," p 38).

The purpose of the second 1932 Comintern document was to help Japan's communists to surmount the new left-wing opportunistic errors related to underestimating tasks of a bourgeois-democratic nature, which had remained topical in Japan at that period. The document drew attention to the aggressive nature of Japanese imperialism, which concealed the threat of converting from isolated aggressive actions in the Far East to unleashing a widespread war. The analysis of the situation and the tasks contained in the 1932 theses inspired the Japanese communists to struggle against the aggressive plans of the ruling circles of their country and for the overthrow of the monarchy.

Katayama did not limit himself to patient educational work directly among Japanese communists. Leaders of the trade union and peasant movements and the progressive intelligentsia in Japan knew him well and listened to his advice.

In addition to concern for the CPJ, which he represented in the headquarters of the global communist movement, and involvement in other purely Japanese matters, Katayama's activities included two other particularly strong areas of interest: helping to found and develop communist parties in oriental countries and actively participating in all anti-imperialist and antiwar international actions.

On the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the founding of the Comintern, noting the initial successes in its activities in the Far East, Katayama emphasized that "the Comintern must play a major role in the future revolutionary struggle in the Orient.... The communist and labor movements in Far Eastern countries are young and inexperienced. They must be helped and led by the Comintern, the leader of the proletariat" (KOMMUNISTICHESKIY INTERNATSIONAL, No 1, 1924, pp 211-212).

Katayama himself studied extensively the situation in these countries, met with representatives of their revolutionary organizations and helped them with

words and actions. At the Fifth Comintern Congress, which was held after Lenin's death, he called for firmly following Lenin's concepts of the national problem. "The exploited peoples of colonial and semicolonial countries," Katayama said, "have become inseparable comrades of the revolutionary proletariat. Support of the revolutionary movement among these peoples has become the intrinsic task of the latter." Indicating that this approach to the national problem has given it an "entirely new" significance, different from the position held by the Second International, Katayama proudly noted that the Comintern "considers everyone equal, civilized and uncivilized, whites, blacks and yellows alike" ("Pyatyy Vsemirnyy Kongress Kommunisticheskogo Internatsionala. Stenograficheskiy Otchet" [Fifth World Congress of the Communist International. Minutes]. Part I, Moscow-Leningrad, 1925, p 618).

Due to the varieties of national liberation movements, Katayama demanded a thorough study of their nature in the individual oriental countries and the formulation of flexible tactics toward bourgeois and petit bourgeois national movements. He ascribed particular importance to the formulation of the "most suitable" tactics toward the peasant mass movement in colonies and semicolonies, as peasants in such countries account for the majority of the toiling masses.

Katayama actively participated in Comintern discussions of problems relative to the situation in oriental countries and the activities of their communist parties. He was invariably interested in the revolutionary events in China. During his visit to the country in 1925, Katayama studied the circumstances on the spot and met among others with Li Dazhao, one of the founders of the CPC. The main point which Katayama made in his works and speeches on the Chinese problem of that period was to emphasize the need for unification among all revolutionary forces in that country under anti-imperialist and anti-militaristic slogans. History confirmed the accuracy of this line, which the Comintern persistently recommended to the Chinese communists.

The development of the struggle waged by the Chinese people against imperialism was assisted by a "factor of tremendous importance," as defined by Katayama, such as the influence of the October Revolution. Soviet Russia, he wrote, was the only one to treat China "as an equal." Soviet Russia is the best friend of the Chinese people (see Sen Katayama, "Kitay (Ekonomicheskiy Ocherk)" [China (Economic Outline)]. Moscow-Leningrad, 1926, p 5).

Katayama noticed that the first socialist country in the world showed the same type of relations of respect and equality toward Mongolia as well, which he visited on his return from Beijing. Noting that Mongolia is a "truly independent revolutionary republic," he wrote in his notes on that country that "Mongolia enjoys the great support of Soviet Russia. Unlike the policy pursued by the imperialists in China, the influence of Soviet Russia and its support are of tremendous benefit to Mongolia instead of blocking its development and growth of the people's well-being" (ZHIZN' BURYATII, No 5-6, 1925, p 4).

Imperialism and aggressive wars are indivisible concepts. Katayama always stood in the leading ranks of the fighters against imperialism and used all

available opportunities to expose the military plans of imperialist powers, regardless of imperialism's national coloring--Japanese, German, British, French or American--and called for the unification of anti-imperialist forces with a view to rebuffing the policy of war and all other forms of imperialist intervention in the affairs of foreign countries.

As an internationalist, Katayama exposed Japanese imperialism more frequently and sharply than all others, considering it the strongest force and support of reaction in the Far East. From the very beginning of the foreign intervention against the young Soviet Russia in the Far East, Katayama described the activities of the Japanese government as a "policy of most naked violence." With other like-minded people, he addressed himself from the United States to the Japanese working people with the call to rise to the struggle against criminal militarism and to join the solidarity movement of the workers the world over, who had raised the slogan "Hands Off Soviet Russia"! In Moscow, the Japanese revolutionary plunged into organizing the spreading of antiwar feelings among the personnel of the Japanese armed forces which had invaded the Soviet Far East. Katayama personally drafted leaflets in which he tried to explain to the troops in simple and clear language the true objectives which guided the ruling Japanese circles, who had sent them to fight Russian workers and peasants. Addressing a session of the RKP(b) Central Committee Dal'buro in Chita in June 1922, Katayama noted the importance of expanding agitation activities among Japanese troops, in which Japanese internationalists as well were being recruited. He explained that, on the one hand, this would help the working people in Soviet Russia in their struggle for building a new world and, on the other, the political education of the Japanese working people themselves, and would mobilize them to act against the militaristic police regime.

As we know, the attempts of the united forces of domestic and foreign reaction to stop the wheel of history and turn our country back to the old capitalist order, failed. After expelling the foreign interventionists and defeating the domestic counterrevolutionary forces, the peoples of the Soviet Union gained a breathing spell and were able to engage in peaceful toil. The entire world closely followed the building of socialism, which had developed in the USSR. In noting the tremendous accomplishments of the land of the soviets during the first 10 years of the Great October Revolution, Katayama wrote: "The very fact that this great country, which covers one-sixth of the globe, is developing under proletarian dictatorship and has set itself the practical task of building socialism, is a tremendous victory for the world revolutionary movement and a tremendous contribution to the struggle waged by the international proletariat." According to Katayama, another reason for the international significance of the October Revolution was that this historical event had a profound impact "on the mentality of colonial and semicolonial peoples, under whose very eyes the numerous nationalities in the Soviet Union, previously under tsarist oppression, had acquired full freedom and true equality" (quoted from PROBLEMY DAL'NEGO VOSTOKA, No 1, 1984, p 115).

Katayama realized that the imperialist powers had not given up the hope of destroying the Soviet Union. He was among those who deemed it necessary to warn at the top of one's voice of the growing threat of the outbreak of a new war against the USSR. In particular, he anticipated the inevitability of war

in the Far East, the main role in which would be played by Japanese imperialism. The choice of the main strike was to depend on a number of factors. As early as 1925, Katayama did not exclude the fact that by virtue of grave Japanese-American interimperialist contradictions, under favorable conditions Japanese imperialism "would try to resolve its quarrel with America on hegemony in the Far East at the point of the sword" (Sen Katayama, "Yaponiya i Amerika" [Japan and America]. Moscow, 1925, p 59). At the same time, he justly believed that the Japanese imperialists would prefer to aim their main strike at the Soviet Union.

The study of the Japanese situation in the second half of the 1920s convinced Katayama that Japan was engaged in preparations for a future war. He called upon the public to be vigilant. The invasion by the Japanese militarists of China's northeastern provinces confirmed Japan's aggressive intentions. With the occupation of Manchuria, Katayama wrote in 1932, Japanese imperialism "is laying the necessary conditions" for intervention against the Soviet Union.

Naturally, Katayama saw an equally dangerous increase in the threat of war on the European continent as well. The problem of safeguarding peace and preventing World War II was becoming increasingly urgent as two of its largest centers were being established: in the Far East, as a result of the aggressive actions of Japanese militarism, and in Europe, as a result of the strengthening of fascism in Germany and Italy.

Katayama's participation in the 1927 Congress of Anti-Imperialist Forces in Brussels, where representatives of all colors and shades of the human race, of different levels of civilization and all conceivable political and religious trends and professions had met to express their angry objection to comprehensive anti-imperialist plunder, as he said, followed by participating in the work of the Anti-Imperialist League of Struggle for National Independence, made him an active supporter of the idea of using a broad nonparty organization to mobilize the masses in the struggle against the threat of war. "Available communist forces are insufficient," he reported at the Sixth Comintern Congress. "However, experience proves that the anti-imperialist league can mobilize the masses in the antiwar movement" ("VI Kongress Kominterna. Stenograficheskiy Otchet" (Sixth Comintern Congress. Minutes]. Issue No 1, Moscow-Leningrad, 1929, p 305). Katayama's impassionate speech, in which he severely condemned Japanese imperialism's war preparations, was delivered at the Second Congress of the Anti-Imperialist League in Frankfurt-am-Main, in 1929.

Katayama became one of the initiators of holding a broad antiwar congress in Amsterdam. The congress, which took place in August 1932, was a major step in mobilizing the masses for active antiwar efforts. In Amsterdam, he said at the 12th IKKI Plenum, "workers, peasants and intellectuals of 57 nationalities solemnly swore to the entire world that they will dedicate all their energy to mobilizing the masses in the struggle against imperialist war" ("XII Plenum IKKI. Stenograficheskiy Otchet" [12th IKKI Plenum. Minutes]. Vol III, Moscow, 1933, p 51). As a zealous fighter for peace, Katayama was a member of the constituent congress of the International Committee for Struggle Against War and Fascism. Despite his advanced age and poor health, he participated in its work most actively.

Katayama enjoyed great prestige in the international worker movement and among the fighters for the national liberation of oriental countries, the supporters of peace and the Soviet people's masses. His contemporaries were unanimous in noting his warmth, striking responsiveness and goodness, and gentleness and tactfulness which, however, did not prevent him in the least from remaining passionately intolerant of any injustice and being firm and decisive on matters of principle. "Anyone who worked with him," recalls O. V. Kuusinen, "was impressed by his purposefulness and organization, modesty and great attention to people and his great human charm" (cited from "Zhizn', Otdannaya Bor'be" [Life Dedicated to Struggle]. Moscow, 1966, p 619).

Katayama was deeply respected and valued by his Comintern fellow workers. Here, in the headquarters of the global revolutionary movement, as W. Gallagher wrote, "everyone felt 'a kind of special sympathy' for Sen Katayama, the oldest Japanese socialist, behind whom stretched a long dedicated struggle" (MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN', No 3, 1959, p 72).

Katayama was well-known to the simple people in the Soviet Union. He frequently visited various labor collectives in Moscow and the Moscow area and petroleum workers in Baku and Groznyy. Alongside the builders of the Turksib he celebrated the completion of this largest national construction project of the 1st Five-Year Plan. He also visited many other parts of the Soviet Union. Everywhere he found a common language with workers and peasants. The workers at the Kauchuk Factory elected Katayama honorary deputy to the Moscow Soviet; the Rusakovskoye Street Car Depot in Moscow issued him an honorary fitter's certificate; the textile workers in the Dorokhovo settlement (not far from Orekhovo-Zuyevo) named him honorary member of the local soviet; the peasants of the Moscow Gorki area (today Leniniskiy Rayon) made Katayama an honorary peasant of their rayon.

Sen Katayama died in November 1933. The working people of Moscow, the heads of the Soviet state and his foreign friends solemnly accompanied him on his last trip; Katayama's dust was buried in the Kremlin wall. Sen Katayama is remembered by the Soviet people as a courageous revolutionary, inflexible internationalist, zealous fighter for peace and against imperialist war and loyal friend of the Soviet Union. "As a proletarian," the obituary of the IKKI Presidium pointed out, "he experienced the oppression of the most barbaric Japanese imperialism, armed with a semifeudal whip, and the oppression of the most civilized American capitalism, operating with the help of a false bourgeois democracy. Wherever he found himself by the whim of fate, he immediately plunged into the masses preaching mortal hatred of capital and international unity of the proletariat" (KOMMUNISTICHESKIY INTERNATSIONAL, No 32, 1933, pp 1-2).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/5



# ANSWER TO A LETTER FROM A FELLOW INMATE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84) pp 91-105

[By Ernst Thalmann]

[Text] Ernst Thalmann, one of the most courageous and firm fighters against Hitlerism, did not live to see the victory over fascist Germany by a mere 9 months. This fiery leader of the German proletariat and outstanding personality of the international communist movement was killed on the personal order of the leader of the Third Reich, in Buchenwald on 18 August 1944.

Thalmann was seized by the Gestapo and thrown in jail as early as March 1933, soon after the Nazis assumed power. He spent more than 11 years in strict solitary confinement. However, neither solitary confinement nor tortures or refined excesses against his person were able to break the will of this fearless communist. Even in fascist jail Thalmann did not cease his struggle against the Nazi regime and for a new socialist Germany. Nor did his inquisitive mind stop working. While in jail, Thalmann filled 34 notebooks with his writings and wrote a great many letters, which are of great historical value. He kept in touch with the antifascist underground through his wife and daughter, who visited him and, whenever possible, through clandestine channels. This "bridge to life," as the prisoner himself described his contact with the resistance movement in Germany, never stopped functioning. Thalmann's voice reached the German working people and the peoples of other countries fighting Hitlerism.

Thalmann's last document was a letter to a fellow inmate in Bautzen, written at the start of 1944. In this document, described in detail his long years of confinement.

The ringleaders of the Third Reich realized that despite Thalmann's lengthy isolation the German working people had



not forgotten his name, which remained the flag of the antifascist struggle. That is why, while imposing a stricter regime on the main prisoner of Nazism with every passing year, efforts were made to restrict his contacts with his relatives. It was only when the inevitability of the defeat of Hitlerite Germany and of retribution for the monstrous crimes of fascism became obvious that the jailers' behavior toward Thalmann became strictly correct.

Thalmann perfectly realized, as he openly states in his last letter, that on the eve of their inevitable collapse the Nazis could settle their accounts with him. Nevertheless, he was full of optimism and confidence in the socialist future of the new Germany.

Nor could he exclude the possibility that the letter would fall into enemy hands, for which reason Thalmann could not write frankly about everything. The letter imparts the main thing, however, that which made the fascists fear Thalmann, even behind bars: the invincible strength of the communist spirit, the will to struggle, and faith in the triumph of the proletarian cause.

The letter was published for the first time in the newspaper NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in October 1950. It came out as a separate work in the GDR in 1961 [Ernst Thalmann. "Antwort auf Briefe eines Kerkergenossen" [Answer to a Letter From a Fellow Inmate]. Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1961, 81 pp].

A long excerpt of Thalmann's last letter was printed in our journal in October 1950 (BOL'SHEVIK, No 21, 1950). Following is the full text.

This publication was prepared by G. B. Kavgankin', senior scientific associate, CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

My dear comrade in fate and revolutionary fellow worker in the struggle for socialism!

As I was reading your lines I wanted to hear your voice and penetrate into the essence of your character.

This is a very difficult task, which demands talent and thorough advance training in the study of human psychology. That is why I will be addressing you in plain language, frankly, in the language in which, naturally, a conversation between brothers, friends and revolutionary fighters should take place. This language is political and figurative. It is firm and harsh but also imbued with profound love and great warmth. It is the language of truth, for there is a historical truth, i.e., the necessary consistency between the presentation of facts to be determined and the facts themselves. There is a

political conscience, which demands service to this truth. Truth cannot be falsified for long, for there is nothing more indisputable than facts. Always remember that our conscience is trustworthy and pure. It is not soiled by anything in terms of the toiling German people. It is not burdened by military crimes, imperialist piratical policy, tyranny, terrorism, dictatorship, violation of conscience, deprivation of freedom and arbitrariness, pseudosocialism, fascism, racial theories, philosophizing in the Rosenberg style, arrogance, haughtiness, boastfulness and others. Our cause is just. For that reason alone we can neither acknowledge this world nor, even less so, be tempted by its illusions, but must oppose it with our daring, strong, firm and purposeful views and subject it to a healthy yet merciless criticism, imbued with bitter truth.

Naturally, nor are we some kind of pure and immaculate angels without reproach or blame. We too have made serious and sometimes major political errors in the past; unfortunately, we omitted a great deal and did not do what we had to do in the complex interweaving of past historical events to block fascism's path to state power. However, we recognized our errors and openly spoke of them self-critically; we corrected them and chose new paths in politics, propaganda and the mass struggle. Since we have never been represented in the German government or held power as a single ruling party, our guilt to the German people is reduced. This and many other facts, our constant sacrifices in the struggle against fascism in particular, were and remain the major advantage of our policy and gained us the trust of the masses. The importance of man as a political person can be fully appreciated only when he is judged not only on the basis of what he has achieved but also of what he wanted to achieve. Whoever wants to defeat fate and open for his age new paths and lead his people to a better future, whoever feels within himself the vocation and sets himself the task of firing up other people with his spiritual flames, hurls a challenge to the world of incomprehension, negation and hostility. For struggle alone gives life a meaning!

Unfortunately, in 1933 a considerable majority of the German people were still not understanding us. The people's old position began to change as they experienced the "school" of fascism. In undergoing this new process of restructuring their former views, the people began to look at us and at our views more closely. Already today the national socialist regime has "cured" a significant percentage of our people. That share of the German people, who were on the left or sympathized with the left, trusts us and our party and links its hopes for a better future for Germany with the further steadfast and progressive development of the socialist Soviet Union. Such is the situation today. Who can say what will happen in Germany tomorrow?

We are locked inside a small world. We recreate the picture of the entire big world from concepts which we have no opportunity to experience directly. I frequently think of how restricted life here is compared to the life of other people who enjoy priceless freedom. The isolation of long years of prison, the prison situation which destroys the soul, the four naked walls and many years of deprivation of freedom occasionally make fits of depression and shouts of despair inevitable.

I unwittingly shut my eyes when I remember everything which has flashed by during my imprisonment. One is lucky not to lose one's perspective and die before one's physical death. The walls of isolation can influence anyone and, consequently, us too. Understandably, the complaint triggered by such isolation is a manifestation of the passionate desire to be relieved from it. Yet we have always been able to derive some good from want. No one can witness the terrible pressure of such isolation more accurately than an "expert" who has experienced it for many long years and still is. Perhaps his yearning for wife and children, mother, father, brother or sister, or a friend, for a funny joke and pleasant company and for relaxing with like-minded people or in general for the golden feeling of freedom hits him savagely. In this place many people may become stupefied, yield to self-pity and sink into oblivion and daydreaming. However, if we look into each other's eyes and listen to our inner voices, if we assess the power of our spirit, we would feel the type of power of clarity and captivating force of spiritual greatness and particularly, the power of conviction, which, again and again will pull us out of this depressing, lonely and almost hopeless prison atmosphere.

How great is the effect of belief in the justice of one's cause in a prisoner, as it restores his vital forces! It is precisely this solid foundation that gives the person endurance, spirit, strength and firmness in coping with the vicissitudes of fate. Furthermore, our memories of the past become an active force precisely in terms of serving the future and not when the future becomes an object of hopeless contemplation in which it seems as though the past has come to an end. By courageously opposing our fate today we give meaning to the past and direct our expectations and hopes toward the future. It is thus, between memories and expectations, that we live. The better a person knows where he comes from and where he is going, and the clearer, therefore, are his memories and expectations, the more such a person develops a real personality. Such an expectation does not imply in the least a passive wait but rather a readiness to meet the future resolutely, aware of political objectives, and again and again energized by his recollections. Such an attitude toward recollections strengthens the feeling of life and resistance to the future blows of fate. Recollections of high periods and accomplishments of our past, which fill our soul with pride, give us immeasurable strength.

When you, a firm revolutionary, only 17 years old, found yourself in the dark prison cell, you felt the full horror of the many years of prison lying ahead of you. Now this period, filled with pain, aching and sadness will soon be behind you! Despite these long and harsh years you have not broken down and have not been defeated! You have proved during that time your loyalty to the great cause of the socialist future and you have learned how to swim in the waters of life. You spent your young years in the Hannoverschand Juvenile Prison and the Glasmoor Prison for Adults not far from Harxheide.<sup>2</sup> From there you were transferred to the so-called "model" correctional institution in Bautzen (with an almost daily "vitamin" ration of swede and bad soup), where we indirectly became acquainted with each other. In Hamburg you met with people, you saw the port and the city, you saw poverty and wealth and you became aware of the social problem. This city, where I was born and where I spent my childhood and adolescence, where I grew up and matured and, finally, from a leader in my native place I was called upon to become a leader on the

level of the entire great homeland, you will recall forever as part of your youth. To you these parts precious to and loved by me mean more than a simple inspiring memory: they laid an unforgettable firm beginning of your path as a fighter for socialism. Finally, speaking of your initial years in prison, Hamburg seems like paradise compared with what followed.

It is thus that, year after year, you sacrificed your precious youth to an ideal, to the great cause of socialism. Your life was hard, and these trials were harsh and bitter in your young years! Life was hard and strange yet varied! It was hard on your heart, brimming with the feeling of the meaning of life. Your lot was a joyless youth full of privations, a life which is rarely the fate of the young fighters for freedom. However, even during your imprisonment you were strong and courageous and your deep self-awareness remained inviolable. You remained courageous and firm in your socialist convictions and your greatness in the face of the cruel fate which befell your youth is worthy of admiration!

At this point you probably would like to know something about my own life in exile. It would take even more than a hefty volume to describe the entire variety of emotions and events in my life. That is why I will select only individual events and significant facts and describe them to you in this letter.

I was arrested in Berlin on 3 March 1933, in a room which I was renting from a war invalid. I usually stopped there when visiting Berlin. A group of gun-toting policemen--20 officers headed by a lieutenant rushed into the apartment and then into my room. The lieutenant was calm and sensible, but his subordinates were excited and showed no restraint in their behavior. I was handcuffed, put in a car and taken to the nearest police precinct and from there, guarded by a special police unit, to the Berlin police presidium on Alexanderplatz. There I was interrogated briefly but gave no evidence whatsoever. After 5 hours I was finally taken to a cell in the local police jail. I was treated normally but once in a while rascals from the notorious gendarmerie would come to the door of my cell, threatening to take me out of there to make this my final hour.

It was from that jail that I immediately sent a petition to the imperial high prosecutor, with a request quickly to initiate an investigation of my case, for I was not aware of having committed any punishable action. I took this step in any case, to prevent them from sending me to a concentration camp. I was successful.

I was moved to the investigations prison in Berlin, in the Old Moabit. There I was treated indifferently and, toward the end, normally. I spent 2.5 years in preliminary investigative detention; during that time I was interrogated by four investigators 10 hours or more every day. I was shown most important and other materials pertaining to the party's leadership and its organizations throughout Germany, which constituted the charges against me, for identification and interpretation. All of my speeches and articles, materials on sessions held by the Secretariat, the Politburo, and the Central Committee and other party conferences, and large meetings and gatherings at which I had spoken had been procured and were used in the interrogations. Finally, a

thorough investigation was made of the party's general policy, its current work and organizational activities, and numerous documents and party publications to which a large number of materials forged and fabricated by secret agents were added. The policies and work of mass organizations, including the Alliance of Red Front Veterans, were equated with party activities. I was also charged with full responsibility for the Communist Youth League. This was quite a lot for one person!

Despite all of this, politically I behaved as a revolutionary should. As a leader of the communist movement, I defended all the decisions made by the party's Central Committee and the Communist International, and assumed full responsibility for them. Firmly and in accordance with my feeling of duty, I energetically rejected all demands to name or betray party leaders and workers. Despite all sorts of traps and lies, throughout the interrogations the investigators failed to make me fall into a trap or force me into betraying my fellow workers and the cause of communism. Occasionally this led to violent scenes and sharp arguments, as a result of which the interrogations were postponed to later days. After the investigators had failed in their efforts to obtain or extort from me admissions to help the prosecution, they turned to the Gestapo for help.

In January 1934 I was put into a car by four Gestapo officials and transferred from Moabit to the building which housed the Gestapo administration (Berlin, Prinz Albrechtstrasse). I was taken straight from the car to the office of the investigator, on the fourth floor. Eight Gestapo officials of medium and high rank were waiting for me. They mockingly raised their fists, mimicking the "Red Front!" salute.

I find it virtually impossible to describe what took place in that room for 4.5 hours, from 5 to 9:30 pm. In order to extract admissions and obtain information on previously detained comrades and political activities by all possible means, the most cruel methods of threats and violence were used against me, of a kind one could only imagine. Initially, the Gestapo officials faked a familiar tone, for I had met a few of these rascals from the time of Zewering's political police. They started with good-natured persuasion and the like, in the hope that by distracting me they would make me betray a comrade or find out something of interest. This maneuver failed totally. It was followed by open physical violence. They started beating me up and broke four of my teeth. This too, however, failed to yield the desired results. The third action was the use of hypnosis which had absolutely no effect on me because of my still-strong nervous system. Although the hypnotizer spent nearly 45 minutes working on me, while I was on my knees, I remained entirely calm and clear-minded while he asked his questions. This took 3.5 hours, and I no longer hoped for a successful outcome, filled as I was with hatred and rage. However, the final act was the culmination of this drama. I was made to undress, after which two of these rascals grabbed me by the shoulders and put me across a stool while a third Gestapo man in uniform used on me a whip made of hippopotamus leather. The pain was such that I shrieked repeatedly!

Then they shut my mouth and started to pound my face with their fists and whip me on the chest and back. I fell down and crawled on the floor, trying to

keep my face down, and no longer answered the questions. They kicked me in the legs while I kept trying to protect my face. However, I was so exhausted and felt such a pain in the area of my heart that I could no longer see or hear anything. Furthermore, I was so thirsty that I began to foam at the mouth and nearly strangled. Although semiconscious, I still retained a certain awareness. However, I had stopped feeling all pain and could only think of the end to this torture. Suddenly, however, someone rushed into the room and whispered to the others that the cleaning women and others still in the premises could hear loud cries. He asked that the interrogation be ended.

The Gestapo officials ended their evil fun at 9:30 pm. The bleeding wounds on my head were bandaged and a scarf was thrown around my wounded neck. I was ordered to sit on a stool facing the wall and threatened that I would be shot immediately if I were to turn around. Two Gestapo officials pointed their guns at me. Naturally, I turned around to see what the further intentions of these rogues were. However, nothing else happened. A waiter was summoned from the cafeteria, who brought them food and drinks. He looked at me with sad compassion. Then, I was taken down an elevator to the basement and thrown into a cell. Eight days later, and again 2 days after that, I was interrogated again in the presence of no more than two or three Gestapo officials. Since I had not changed tactics, I was warned that if I continued to behave in the same manner in the future, they would repeat the method they had used on me until I changed my ways. However, matters developed differently. Quite unexpectedly, Herman Goring, who was still in charge of this department, asked to inspect all premises in the Gestapo building; this also included the newly completed isolation jail, which was in the basement of the building. During the inspection Goring approached the door of my cell and, noticing my horribly disfigured face, asked what had happened. Although I could not anticipate the future intentions of this gang of murderers, I told him that I had been beaten up and that the nights I had spent in this basement were horrible and disgusting. It is true that I was left alone, but the new detainees which were brought there during the night were regularly being beaten up. In a narrow, specially equipped dark passage approximately 30 meters long they were forced to face the wall sometimes for hours. In order to frighten them, once in a while during the night shots were fired and the people were subjected to other kinds of excesses as well.

I showed Goring areas on my body where I had bled internally and the blue-yellow swellings and my blood-stained sheet and pillow. About half an hour later I was taken to a room on the second floor, where I was seen by a department chief at the ministry (of internal affairs--the editor), Diels, then chief of the Gestapo administration and a friend of Goring's (today general director of the Herman Goring Company, dealing with river navigation). Diels turned to me with a few words. Meanwhile, Goring entered the room. He first announced that he had spoken with the officials, who had interrogated me and that all of them claimed that I had allegedly categorically refused to provide testimony to Gestapo officials wearing a military uniform (actually, during those 3.5 hours seven of the eight officials who had been present at the interrogation were wearing civilian clothes and only one of them, the one who had whipped me, was wearing a storm trooper's uniform. It is true that from time to time other Gestapo men had come into the room, some of them in uniform, who also behaved basely, but who left soon afterwards). Goring then



began blabbering about some political problems. I heard him out calmly, saying nothing. Meanwhile, Diels began to make jokes in order to change the topic.

At that point, I suddenly realized that neither of them was interested in the least in what I had experienced but only wished to put an end to this matter. I told them briefly and firmly, without details, what had happened. "I beg of the minister-president to give me 2 minutes of his time. First, the statement of those who were present at my interrogation, which took 4.5 hours and was accompanied with tortures, that I had categorically refused to answer officials in uniform does not correspond to reality, for only one of them was in uniform. Therefore, there is no point in discussing this lie. Secondly, if you, Mr Minister-President, would be kind enough to answer my wish or request, it would be only that I be taken out of this hell as soon as possible and returned to Moabit." I faced them pale but cool. He answered in the affirmative. "I will meet your request, but in future interrogations by investigators you must change the nature of your answers." I answered that whenever interrogated I had behaved myself quite correctly and in accordance with the law. I was then asked to leave. Some 200 employees and Gestapo officials were lined up along the hall to watch this show. They stared at me as I left the room.

Let me also add that Goring, who had heard during the inspection my report that I had been beaten up, held a loud conversation with Diels and other gentlemen in such a way that I could hear it from my cell. Goring asked Diels: "Who was the investigator in Thalmann's case?" Diels answered: "Braun, the president of the land court." Goring exclaimed: "Is this not the same person who had interrogated two of ours in the past?" (meaning two officers, Scheringer and Ludin, members of the NSDAP, who were among those accused in the Ulm affair of the Reichswehr, and who were tried by the imperial court in Leipzig. During his imprisonment in the Holnow fortress, Lieutenant Scheringer joined the Communist Party of Germany, whereas Luden, despite a great deal of wavering, had remained a NSDAP member).<sup>3</sup> After his question was answered in the affirmative, Goring objected: "This idiot should not interrogate Thalmann. This is unacceptable under any circumstances!" (Let me add that Braun, the president of the land court, was indeed very stupid when it came to organizing and conducting interrogations. However, he was a firm enemy of our party and full of hatred for me, for DIE ROTE FAHNE<sup>4</sup> kept attacking him sharply on the eve of Hitler's seizure of power).

Five days after my conversation with Goring, accompanied by four Gestapo officials, who had been present at the beating I received, I was driven to Moabit. On the way, one of these executioners warned me with extreme impudence that if during my trial by the imperial court I were to describe publicly what I had been subjected to during the Gestapo interrogation, he would take me out of the court and put me in a place where my mouth would be shut once and for all. I listened to him silently but thought: Try it, Goetz von Berlikingen....<sup>5</sup> I, however, will not lose the opportunity to produce this sensation. When the chief of the Moabit Prison section in which I had already been locked welcomed me again, he quietly said: "Thalmann, Thalmann, how unwell you look, deadly pale, thin in the face, disturbed! What shook you up?"



Virtually the entire world and many people in Germany became aware of the Thalmann drama, which had been played in the Gestapo administration. The rumor spread abroad that Thalmann was dead. For that reason, the Hitlerite regime was forced to harness all possible delegations, including one consisting of members of different parties of the then-plebiscite Saar region,<sup>6</sup> to show them Thalmann in Moabit. All this drama was played in such a way as to prevent me from establishing contact with these delegations, which visited me accompanied by Gestapo officials and representatives of the investigation authorities. Nevertheless, I was able to shout to the Saar delegates, looking at the Gestapo men: "Let me tell you that it is precisely in their hands that I was cruelly tortured and that they were present!" However, the delegation was immediately led out and this marked the end of the show.

During the entire period of my preliminary incarceration, from the day I was detained to the reading of the indictment, I was frequently visited by all kinds of delegations: foreign journalists and jurists of world fame, Count Rosen from Sweden, personalities from Norway, Denmark, Sweden and the United States, and others.

At one point a delegation consisting of more than 50 world-renowned jurists came to Moabit.

After about half a year of preliminary internment I was given the indictment, which was 260 pages thick. While I was being investigated in Berlin, the imperial court had been replaced by a so-called "people's tribunal," which was to try my case. The preparation of the case for trial was assigned to the second senate of the "people's tribunal," headed by senate president (?)<sup>7</sup> Bruner (from Munich).

During the final stage of the preliminary investigation, I was offered two lawyers: one from Hamburg, to be chosen by me, and an official defender from Berlin. A third lawyer, from Dortmund, also agreed to be part of the defense. The indictment itself was imbued with lies and included a shameless selection of materials, which were totally demolished at the very beginning of the Thalmann trial. After my study of the four basic charges, I intended to mount a decisive headlong offensive against this falsehood. I intended to act not as the accused or as a defendant but as a prosecutor of the organs of the prosecution who had concocted such a monstrous lie. This would have created not only a staggering sensation for the court hearing the case, those present at the trial, lawyers the world over and the German and world press, but would have also represented a triumph for my comrades in Germany and throughout the world.

This would have overwhelmed even my worst enemies, who could not even imagine that a former stevedore from Hamburg, who had not graduated from any kind of high school or university but had extensive practical experience and practical knowledge of life, could publicly expose and nail to the pillar of shame this entire parody of law and justice. This would turn into defendants not only the prosecutor in chief, Dr Werner, and his senior assistant, State Prosecutor Dr Brenneke, and the four investigators working under them, but also the

Gestapo administration with the four provocateurs they had bribed (who had previously held both high and low positions in our party). The very content of the indictment would have made it possible systematically to expose legal errors, unconscientiousness, lies, cruel behavior and treason. The accusers would have been covered with shame juridically and would have been unable to avoid political failure. During the preliminary investigation of my case the high judiciary sensibly tried to avoid even a hint of the case of the burning of the Reichstag. Why? You too will understand this after this devilish plan has been suitably exposed. The "Program for National and Social Liberation" we had published on the occasion of the 1930 Reichstag elections, with slogans such as "For Freedom, Socialism, Work and Bread!" and "For a Free Socialist Germany!" and a great deal of others, even materials which exposed the Nazis, were equally not included in the indictment during the preliminary investigation.

At the trial I would have made public everything which the prosecution would have deliberately concealed. I had already summoned more than 200 witnesses from all parts of Germany, very few of whom appeared at the preliminary investigation, mainly those who, it is true, because of ignorance and without any malice, had made depositions which could be interpreted as proof against me. I had also summoned witnesses who should have been interrogated during the trial, and had requested witnesses from abroad, in my defense and for submitting proof of my innocence (such as Stalin, Molotov, Manuil'skiy and many other foreign comrades and personalities).

The prosecution listed in the indictment 32 witnesses, 16 from the Gestapo administration alone, of higher and middle rank, and the four provocateurs on its pay.

During one of my wife's visits to Moabit, Dr Zieger, who was in charge of supervising prisons (a former district judge in Alton), who was both a judge and a member of the second senate of the "people's tribunal," told me that more than 1,000 journalists from all over the world, not counting those in Germany, had applied for permission to witness the trial. The judges themselves, he said, doubted that a suitable premise in which to hold the trial could be found in Berlin.

I had many stormy discussions with my two lawyers (both were members of the NSDAP but were also quite skilled as lawyers and not stupid politically), with whom I had to discuss my forthcoming expository speech and of whom I asked for materials needed to prove my innocence and for summoning defense witnesses. At first they understood very little of what I said. It was only later in the course of our discussions, that I was able to convince both of them of the strength of my legal stand. Having realized the superiority of this position, they also realized that in substantiating its indictment, the prosecution would find itself in an exceptionally difficult situation. It is entirely likely, therefore, that one of my defenders, I would have to assume, informed the prosecution of this fact and cautioned them.

As time went on, a Thalmann Defense Committee was set up abroad, which included noted personalities from virtually all public strata throughout the world, including the higher clergy. The committee assumed great international

significance. Since it could influence world public opinion by raising questions about the preliminary investigation and the forthcoming trial, the Hitlerite authorities were forced to supply materials for preparing the Thalmann case, consisting of two editorials published in the German press. The articles, written by noted jurists, such as the imperial chief prosecutor, Dr Werner, and Professor Dr Grimm from Essen, merely noted, in connection with the forthcoming Thalmann trial, the existence of antigovernment actions and a discussion of the legal aspects of the case, in the sense that no hindrances would be created in the conduct of Thalmann's defense and that he will not be deprived of other possibilities of proving his innocence.

This tied the hands and feet of the prosecution and significantly facilitated my legal status in connection with the petitions I had submitted as proof of my innocence. It was self-evident that under a Hitlerite regime this was still possible only because this was 1935. By 1938 a trial of such political significance and on such a legal base would have been entirely inconceivable. This comparison reflects quite clearly the changed conditions as a result of the aggravation of the internal situation in Germany. It happens occasionally in big politics and frequently in the life of human society that one side passionately wants a trial while another not only fears it but believes that such a trial would turn into a political catastrophe for it. It was for all of these reasons that, to my great sorrow, my trial did not take place. I was not fated to experience the tremendous happiness which such a great expository trial would have given us. Our party and my friends regretfully had to reconcile themselves to the impossibility of a triumph which we would unquestionably have achieved in such a trial.

Meanwhile, I was not spared further blows by fate, which hit some members of my family. My good-hearted father, stricken by a brain hemorrhage caused by all these tribulations, died on 31 October 1933. The imperial chief prosecutor approved my request of allowing me to attend the funeral. However, the Gestapo administration refused point-blank. My father-in-law, with whom I was very close and who had lived in my home, and whom I had supported materially and morally, died in January 1934.

My dear wife has always been and remains a loyal and firm companion of my life. Throughout that time she suffered and experienced with me a great deal and did for me much that was good and unforgettable. During the first years of my imprisonment, she was constantly watched by the Gestapo and to this day is still occasionally kept under surveillance. Her calm awareness of her duty to me, during the many years of my imprisonment, is a constant reminder of the severe struggle against fate which both of us endured! In the past few years my modest daughter has been happily married with the son of the owner of an electrical machine shop in Zingen, not far from Hoentville. Her husband is currently a private in the motorized infantry (in a penal battalion), fighting in southern Italy. My daughter was still a school student when I was detained. Since then she has developed into a daring, thoughtful and intelligent woman. She has matured politically and understands world events and their consequences much better than many adult German men. She loves and honors her father and is proud of him and his name. She is my great joy and treasured hope. My sister is married to a very religious man. She stands aside from politics but has feelings of respect and sympathy for her brother.

During the aerial bombing of Hamburg my sister and her husband were stricken by fate. Their house was destroyed and currently they live in their plot outside the city, in Sasel. Some of my best and most loyal friends in Hamburg and elsewhere in Germany, unfortunately, have been unable to escape their fate: they were either tortured to death, shot to death or otherwise brutally killed. Their self-sacrifice and death, however, will not have been in vain!

During that time I have also learned about many horrible events and misfortunes. However, I cannot describe them in view of this place and time.

On 1 November 1935 I was presented with two documents: one from the second senate of the "people's tribunal," through state prosecutor Dr Brenneke; the second, from the Gestapo administration, delivered by Hauptsturmfuehrer SS Muller. These documents contained a decree on my preventive detention and the police steps to be taken should I be released.

Approximately in the middle of April 1937, two Gestapo officials showed up in my apartment in Hamburg and demanded of my wife to surrender all letters and postcards I had sent to her and to my daughter since my detention. These letters and post cards had already been read and checked both by the court and the Gestapo and their delivery had been authorized. My wife, who had filed them in a suitable place, surrendered them to the Gestapo officials.

During my wife's next visit, I asked the Gestapo official, who supervised the visits, the reason for which they had confiscated and taken away the letters. His answer was to prevent their publication. He particularly emphasized that such letters, should they become known to the public, could make an extraordinarily strong impression on the readers. I pointed out to him that until then no one had even thought of publishing them, but even assuming that they had been made public, it amazed me that the Nazi regime was afraid of Thalmann's letters which, furthermore, had been censored by the Gestapo and the court and only then allowed to be delivered (a few, considered objectionable, had been confiscated by the Gestapo). I added that I could not fully understand such a feeling of weakness shown by the Hitlerite regime concerning my letters, which totally amazed me. He then again mentioned the significance and effectiveness of such letters and let it be understood that I would never get them back. This was a cruel blow which saddened me.

Let me explain the very essence of the matter.

I had written these letters cleverly and in a very interesting way so that, if possible, their confiscation would be prevented, although in a number of instances I had failed. Political ideas had been skillfully concealed. They carried the flame of strong convictions. Particularly important were four letters written in different years on the occasions of my daughter's birthday. It was through them that I was educating my daughter from behind prison walls. It was a father speaking to his child in her youth, turning to the years of storms and struggle of my own youth and life, as it ripened in its development, and wealth of acquired practical experience and knowledge of life. However, even letters of 10 to 12 pages, which discussed exclusively of the works of great masters of world poetry, such as Shakespeare and Schiller, had been confiscated. A letter on the great miracle of the 20th century--the

development of the Soviet Union--one assumes failed to avoid the same fate, not to mention the very long New Year's messages, which contained a survey of the past year's events and a study of the future development of events during the new year. Virtually all of them had fallen victim to the censorship.

In this stressed period of my prison life, crowded with emotions, I was able to draw from the depth of my soul an unexpectedly great deal. As a person with strong feelings, original thoughts and unusual willpower, I had been able to give such letters an unusual content, a most lively style and proper maturity. Looking back at this time of imprisonment, which turned out to be so creative for me, I recall today Goethe's sentence: "Letters are among the most significant monuments which a person leaves behind."<sup>8</sup>

Since subsequently it had been ordered that my wife and daughter could read my letters to them only at the police station of my district and not be delivered to them, from that time on (i.e., for almost 7 long years) I did not write a single letter or postcard to those who were closest to me. To a person in jail this is such a great and painful sacrifice, such a depressing burden that to withstand them, while keeping oneself under control, seems more than one can bear. That is what I feel today, as I look back to the emotion-filled prison life during my imprisonment in Moabit. What I experienced and suffered, my life, which fate had generously endowed with flights of the spirit and depressions, and filled with suffering and happiness, all of this had found its concentrated expression in these letters. A new stage in my life in exile was beginning.

On 13 August 1937 I was transferred to the Hanover Prison. I was picked up early in the morning from Moabit. Three cars were used, with all seats occupied, to transfer me to my new prison. Those who accompanied me included two court officials (Marx and Hoffman); a Gestapo official (Heller), the warden of the Moabit Prison (Dr Struwe) and five security guards--three from Moabit and two from the Gestapo--all of them in civilian clothing. On my request we stopped at a village away from the highway, to drink and eat something. The trip itself was without incident. In the Hanover Prison I was able to lead quite a decent life. My surroundings were impeccable and I liked the character, behavior and language of the prison personnel, as the worker from Hamburg that I was. Nevertheless, here again there were some unexpected developments, above all the doubled number of guards with carbines who accompanied me on my walks, and total isolation from all people with the exception of the chief of the prison section and some members of the prison administration. Having considered my objections and petition for the elimination of such measures of strict prison regime, the total isolation was somewhat eased and soon afterwards I was allowed to take walks accompanied by a single unarmed guard.

No answer was given to a request submitted by my wife on 25 May 1937 to Minister President Colonel General Goring, through the chancery on Leipzigerplatz in Berlin, although she had added a self-addressed stamped envelope. She objected in her letter to the confiscation of my letters and postcards and raised the question of my possible release.

It was for that reason that sometime by the end of the autumn in 1937, during a visit with my wife and in the presence of a representative of the Gestapo, Criminal Police Counsel Opitz, that I wrote a brief letter to Goring, referring to the lack of an answer to the letter I mentioned. I gave my wife a difficult assignment: on a suitable occasion to deliver the letter to Goring personally, thus avoiding any kind of red tape. Sometime at the beginning of 1938 it was announced that Goring will visit Hamburg. My wife decided to use this occasion to carry out my assignment. Rooms had been reserved for Goring at the Atlantik Hotel. Despite the strict security arrangements, my wife was able to enter the hotel before his arrival. When Goring, after getting off the train at the Dammtor Railroad Station, was driven off to the hotel, she was still there, on the fourth floor. Goring's rooms were on the first floor. Guards stood inside and outside all entrances. It took only a few seconds for my wife to hurry from the fourth to the first floor. On the stairs leading to the first floor she espied Goring, who was approaching the hotel. She intended to deliver the letter personally. At the last moment, however, she was caught and immediately taken to one of the rooms on the first floor. The matter was dealt with quickly, the letter was given to a representative of Goring and she was arrested on the spot. Two guards in military uniform drove her in an open car to the town hall where Hamburg's main police administration was located. The sight of a woman sitting in the car drew the attention of the public crowded in front of the hotel, and some of those present recognized Mrs Thalmann. She was detained in the town hall from 10 am to midnight on the second day, i.e., for the duration of Goring's stay in Hamburg, which he left from the Dammtor Railroad Station. Throughout that time she was stared at by a variety of officials and was given no food.

Several days later, she was notified that she address herself for personal matters to Goring's adjutant Ober-Leutnant Petzold, who worked at the Ministry of Aviation. She turned to him on two or three occasions, in writing, but I can no longer remember accurately with what results. I know, however, that she failed to secure the return of the confiscated letters and post cards, and a consideration of the petition for my release. Subsequently, it was said that Petzold had been transferred, for which reason this connection was quickly broken.

I was informed that I could continue to write letters, providing that my wife and daughter would be allowed to read them at the police station of my district, but could not keep them.

Toward the end of August 1938, for the first time I was visited by my wife without supervision, i.e., without visible witnesses. However, since we had become quite experienced, we were very mistrustful of this privilege. Independently of each other, we had reached the correct conclusion and had the firm conviction that our talks would be monitored with the help of a listening device concealed in the wall or elsewhere. Since we were not short of cunning, we discussed only things which the listeners themselves knew, i.e., whatever was of personal interest to us we communicated by other means. I subsequently learned that our assumptions had proved to be correct. This refined trap was used in the course of our initial visits. Subsequently, it was abandoned, in all likelihood, this listening method having proved to be quite expensive and complex, and impossible to keep secret in a jail over a



long period of time. Since that time, all my visits with my wife and daughter were held in my cell, without supervision. This did not exclude periodical appearances of Gestapo officials at different times. In March 1939, I was visited by medical counselor Wedige, from the Imperial Ministry of Justice, and several members of the prison personnel, to determine the state of my health. As a result of this visit, which took 2.5 hours, in the course of which, among others, I asked to be transferred to a two-person cell, I was notified in May by the state prosecutor general Dr Schnering, in the presence of other officials, that I was to be granted the following privileges: my wife would be able to visit me once every 14 days; I could share my cell with another prisoner; by extending by time outdoors, I was given the possibility of planting flowers and other plants in the prison yard (unfortunately, I could not avail myself of this privilege because of other considerations).

My daughter visited me on the occasion of my silver wedding anniversary, on 13 January 1940. On 15 June 1940 my daughter Irma married Henrich Fester, from Zingen, not far from Hoentville, in our apartment in Hamburg.

On 9 July 1942 I was told by my wife that my son-in-law had been arrested in Zingen in his workshop. He was tried on 25 August 1942 in Konstanz and sentenced to 1 year in jail minus his preliminary detention. On 8 December 1942 my son-in-law was drafted straight from the prison, thus having spent no more than 3.5 months in jail.

On 2 October 1942 my wife was ordered to leave Zingen, although she had done absolutely nothing to deserve this. During my wife's visit, which took place immediately after that, I raised the question of her exile from Zingen and immediately petitioned that this order of exile, issued by the chief of the district's administration, be revoked right away. My wife was able to return from Hamburg to the Zingen apartment of our daughter in January 1943, where she still lives.

In the 6 years I spent in Hanover a mutual agreement was reached between me and the prison warden, which left nothing to be desired. The general state prosecutor (Dr Schnering) also showed the better side of his nature. Let us add to this the weekly visits of all kinds of lawyers who had been assigned from the Reich to the Hanover Prison to carry out practical research. From time to time I was visited by representatives of the Imperial Ministry of Justice, such as Marx, a member of its central apparatus, who saw me no fewer than six times, senior government adviser Hoffman (who came from my part of the country), who also came to see me here as well,<sup>9</sup> and various members of the Gestapo such as, for example, senior government adviser Heller, who was in charge of my case, Criminal Police Director Vogt, criminal police adviser Opitz, and Heisler. At the beginning of this period I was also visited twice by each lawyer.

As far as major illness was concerned, I developed recurrent gastrointestinal colics due to nerves, severe headaches, frequent inflammation of the gums and, from time to time, attacks of gout and rheumatism.



I shall never forget the days and nights of bombing which I personally experienced. On 11 August 1943 I was transferred from the Hanover Prison to the Bautzen correctional prison in Saxony.

This time I was taken in a single Gestapo car and accompanied only by senior government counselor Heller and the Hanover Prison warden, senior government adviser Suffenplan. We stopped in Hartz, past the city of Goslar, in a hotel somewhat higher up in the mountains. It turned out that Hamburg families which had been bombed out had been relocated there. I was recognized by women from Hamburg as we were sitting at a table in the courtyard. What could they have thought about this?

We made a detour to Oschatz in Saxony (between Leipzig and Dresden) for a quick dinner. We spent about an hour and 15 minutes in a snack bar crowded with military personnel. I was immediately recognized by air force noncommissioned officers and their subordinates, which gave rise to an excitement which lasted about an hour: people went in and out of the establishment, stared and showed their surprise, to the point that even Heller, usually a well-balanced person, who could sense the mood of others, began to worry and became jittery, unable, however, to change anything. The snack bar owner and his wife and all the personnel--literally everyone--came to look at me. Finally, at 6:30 pm we were able to resume our travel. Once again everyone rushed into the street, smiling and waving. The owner's daughter, carrying an infant in her arms, greeted me in parting. Unwittingly, tears came to my eyes from such quiet and unexpected happiness.

On my arrival in Bautzen, at 10:30 pm, I met with the senior administrator of the prison, in the courtyard. In the presence of the gentlemen who had accompanied me, he began to shout orders in an effort to appear important, and introduced himself in dizzying terms. However, informed of the identity of the new prisoner, he quieted down and became silent. I was first taken to a cell in a wing in the prison, the windows of which looked out on the kitchen and which was convenient for observation. Several hours later virtually everyone in the prison had been informed that Thalmann had been brought here. You know the rest. Several days later, virtually all of Bautzen knew that Thalmann had been brought here. Once again, however, it was Thalmann with his family who had to pay for this unavoidable circumstance.

Since my son-in-law's workshop lacked sufficient work supplies during the months of July, August and September of 1943, my daughter used this opportunity to move to Hamburg and live in our apartment, and visit her old friends. On her way to Hamburg she stopped to visit me in Hanover, with the intention of seeing me again when she returned. The bombing of the city with phosphorus and high-explosive bombs started while she was in Hamburg, and she was forced to live in a city that was in flames, shaken by explosions day and night. Detained in the city by these circumstances and by the difficulties involved in settling into our apartment a family which had been bombed out, she remained in Hamburg several weeks longer than she initially intended. Meanwhile, I submitted a request to the Gestapo to inform my daughter in Hamburg of my new address, so that she could see me on her way back. After an initial visit in my present jail, she went to Weisswasser (in Oberlausitz)

where my wife's brother lives. She saw me again 14 days later. Meanwhile, my wife informed me of her forthcoming visit.

Eventually, Dr Plischke, the warden, came to see me and asked that, if my wife were to visit me here, she should make her purchases for me in Bautzen without mentioning my name in the stores. Quite puzzled by this request, I asked why Plischke had formulated it in such terms. He answered that, when in the city, he would like to avoid being asked whether it was true that Thalmann was being kept in this prison. I objected by saying that by now virtually all of Bautzen was aware of this, for which reason there was no point for the people to ask whether I was here or not. I raised the question again during my next conversation with Plischke, and asked him to tell me the real reason for which he had raised this question relative to my wife, for nothing of the sort had occurred in Hanover. He then made a clean breast of it. The point was that the last time he had seen me he had no reliable information about the case involving my daughter, for which reason he had said nothing. Now he could tell me definitely that my daughter, who had come to see me, had mentioned at the fruit stand in Rodich that she was Thalmann's daughter, that her father was in the local prison and that her mother would come to visit him soon. I told Plischke that my daughter's case had nothing to do with my wife, that my daughter was over 21, that she was her own person, that she was not ashamed of mentioning her father's name, and that, furthermore, she loved and was proud of him. Furthermore, the circumstances surrounding this case were not known. I could only assume that in order to procure the vitamins needed by her father, as she bought apples which were not rationed, she was forced to mention my name. Therefore, such charges were inappropriate and bordered on an illegal effort to deprive her of her freedom. My wife had been visiting me in Hanover for 6 years and had always made her purchases there and not one storekeeper had been able to find out--in any case not from her--that she was Mrs Thalmann. Therefore, I considered this request entirely unexpected.

During my wife's first visit in this prison, Heller, accompanied by Plischke, showed up unexpectedly. The first question which was raised and discussed in detail was that of spreading around the fact of my stay in Bautzen. Heller proceeded to inform my wife that her coming to Bautzen and registering in the hotel would require that she be issued an identity card under a different name, which she could obtain from the local Gestapo. She would be asked to surrender to the Gestapo her identity card in the name of Rosa Thalmann, which would be returned to her on her departure. Furthermore, any mail and parcels which my wife and daughter would send to me should be addressed not to me, as usual, but to the government director Dr Plischke or his deputy, etc. The name of the sender would be Dr Schuman. My wife asked Heller to be given at least a permanent certificate under a different name. He refused. She then asked him whether she should also warn our relatives that henceforth they should send all mail and parcels addressed to someone else. Heller hesitated before answering in the negative.

At that point, in an effort to put an end to this entire theatrical stunt, I suggested that the prison administration be instructed to find a room with an official or elsewhere in the vicinity, where my wife could stay while visiting me. My suggestion met initially with approval but, gradually, for understandable reasons, it raised objections.

This entire story is nothing but idiocy and a swindle, for my wife alone has eight brothers and sisters, and if they so wish they could send mail and parcels addressed to me, naturally, as can anyone else in Germany, with the exception of my own family. This is the way in which these dimwits are hoping to prevent my name from spreading around!

Then Heller told my wife the following: a small furnished house with a garden had been inspected for use by the two of us, not far from a camp (where precisely he did not know). We could live together in that little house, shop in the vicinity and go where we wished. For security reasons, I would be placed under light guard provided by the camp. I would have at my disposal a garden and an area where I could walk freely throughout the day. I should bear in mind that such a move could be imminent. My wife opposed this suggestion, although somewhat meekly, but then put it quite well: "Release my husband and then we can live together." I then asked to be allowed to reject this suggestion for the following reasons:

1. You know that in terms of my detention I trust the judicial authorities more, for which reason I do not wish to be placed under anyone else's guard.
2. I categorically object to the fact that you would like to force my wife as well to sacrifice her present freedom and be actually placed under guard. Is it not bad enough that for many years I have been forced to undergo this ordeal? Why should my wife as well be subjected to such a fate? She is keeping house for our daughter and they can comfort each other.
3. The commander of some kind of guard cannot guarantee my personal safety, for in extraordinary circumstances anything could happen.
4. The fact that almost everyone in Saxony is aware of my stay in the Bautzen Prison cannot be blamed on my family, as you, Director Plischke and Mr Heller, are claiming. It is due to other reasons, which have been repeatedly mentioned here. The Nazi regime itself has zealously spread my name by sending me to prison for so many years. That is why neither I nor my family need the popularization of my name, for you seem to be doing this yourselves.

After squabbling on both sides, this final explanation as well came to nothing.

My daughter wanted to visit me on 24 and 25 February 1944<sup>10</sup> although now she had to run her workshop at full capacity. During his latest talk with me, however, Plischke had indicated that my daughter as well, whenever she came to Bautzen, should register under a different name. I discussed the matter with my wife and, having established that she shared my views, during a subsequent talk with Plischke I told him that under these circumstances I would make the great sacrifice of refusing visits from my daughter. This decision, which also demanded great sacrifice on the part of my daughter, met with my wife's full approval, and only exceptional circumstances would have forced us to abandon it. My daughter is a totally blameless married citizen of the country and the attempt to force her to visit me in prison under a false name only because she is the daughter of Thalmann, who has been kept in jail for many

years, is a gross cavil and an abuse of power bordering on illegal deprivation of freedom.

There were other cavils as well (the only way I can describe the actions of the authorities), but I think that the time has finally come to end this part of the letter. My attitude toward Plischke improved considerably after a lengthy and calm discussion with him, but not to the point of being described as satisfactory.

Who could gauge the strength and patience with which we have withstood the suffering of these long years of exile?

Who will understand the tragedy of fate and the blows which we were able to endure only by not allowing ourselves to become unsettled? Life in exile, which is filled with all sorts of disappointments, occasionally tried our patience to the limit. However, even as the forces of darkness raged, we remained firm, decisive and indomitable.

Looking back, the past becomes living reality! I have described here merely individual significant stages in my hard prison life. This is merely a small particle of my experiences. You have been forced to sacrifice your best young years and now your youth is maturing. I too was forced to sacrifice in jail the most active years of my mature age and am now approaching an age when my strength is gradually beginning to weaken. The bitter years of exile deprived you of the precious joys of youth. The years of my youth were many and free, but were also the forerunners of the hard lot of my life in prison, which is still going on.

Think of the fact that life forces the people to fight not for the sake of being vanquished but to conquer it, to learn its harsh yet necessary language and then, feeling young again, rise from the depths to a new life. What we have already experienced can no longer be changed; what the future will bring to us we cannot know exactly, but can only guess or have a premonition about. Therefore, based on the present, we begin to think about our future in life. What, how and where? These are the questions facing us! Do we have the hope inherent in human nature that our sufferings will end?

You are facing the direct question of whether you will fall into the hands of the Gestapo or be drafted in the armed forces. Will it be a regular unit or a penal battalion? You have two possibilities on which you can count: the most likely is that you will be drafted straight from this place, without being allowed to go home; the other is that even before this were to happen, you will be put in the hands of the Gestapo which will investigate your political views. It is quite likely that you will be drafted into a penal battalion, for now virtually all political prisoners under 45 are sent there. For example, I have heard of a military training camp for penal battalions not far from Bodensee, in Heuberg, where political inmates from all parts of the Reich undergo military training, including many of them from Hamburg (as well as those who have already served their term as political prisoners and are only now drafted in the army). The situation there is quite bad in all respects and there have even been frequent cases of arbitrary killings. But keep calm, for most of these former political prisoners are in common military camps and

behave like good comrades. If the Gestapo were to offer to release you several months before the expiration of your term, you must reject the offer firmly, for in the majority of cases this will involve your pledge to join a penal battalion. Therefore, reject the offer point-blank. Nevertheless, it may be that your case is special or that here, in Saxony, the practice is different from that in other parts of the German Reich. During your stay in the Gestapo or the police you must be exceptionally cautious in your contacts with the people there, for spying is commonplace and is practiced everywhere.

You must also show political restraint, for a preliminary investigation of your current political views is unquestionably already taking place without your knowledge.

Therefore, as you are waiting for October, do not be hasty. Be brave and courageous and firmly convinced of the justice of our great cause! And if thanks to your firm spirit and honest and firm nature you are able to surmount further suffering in your life, I share your hope that the time will come when the socialist spring of the nations will rescue many people, including yourself, from this very long martyrdom!

My fate as well lies in the center of the great world events, in the tense political atmosphere of our time and in the day-to-day life of toiling mankind. But many of our courageous fellow workers in the struggle for socialism, who live and carry out their revolutionary duty, while enjoying their precious freedom, are also constantly and directly exposed to that same danger. If they are caught in carrying out revolutionary activities today, tomorrow or the day after, they will be subjected to merciless blows, for the history of the revolutionary struggle fiercely and mercilessly calls for sacrifice. This applies not only to us but to many other fighters as well. Why, and for the sake of what? This question excites today millions of people who are engaged in a harsh and inflexible struggle! This important historical problem affects today virtually all of toiling mankind, one way or another. It is to this that I have dedicated my life. I am not a rootless person. I am a German with great national, as well as international, experience. My people, to whom I belong and whom I love, are the German people and my nation, which I respect and of which I am proud, is the German nation, bold and proud and firm. I am part of the flesh and blood of the German working class and it is precisely as its revolutionary son that I eventually became its revolutionary leader. My life and activities have known and know one thing only: to dedicate my mind, knowledge, experience, energy, all of me, entirely to the toiling German people and to ensuring the better future of Germany through a victorious socialist liberation struggle, which will bring a new spring to the peoples, including the German nation!

As a sailor, I have seen America and England and almost all major European capitals and other parts of the world, thus broadening my knowledge, acquiring practical experience and gaining a better understanding of world events. In the course of many conferences, congresses and other international conferences held by the Communist International, in which I participated, I was in close touch with personalities from virtually all nations on earth. This enabled me to learn a great deal and become thoroughly acquainted with the mores, customs, languages, way of life and character and the social and political

life and revolutionary movements of many different nations. I am familiar with the life and living conditions of German blue- and white-collar workers and employees, small entrepreneurs, craftsmen, toiling peasants and intellectuals, from my own practical experience. I was a common worker for 22 years and mastered a variety of skills. Living under the roof of my parents who, having moved to Hamburg from the countryside, engaged in private petty trade for 40 years, I became familiar with the life of the small entrepreneurs and working peasants, from childhood and early youth. I would digress quite a bit were I to try to consider here in detail the considerations which unfortunately prompted my parents to leave me without any education. My parents' main consideration was that I should work at the store whatever the circumstances and, subsequently, take over. The fact that things took an entirely different turn was for the better, for it was precisely thanks to this that I became what I am today.

The martyrdom I assumed and am experiencing for the sake of the great socialist ideals of the 20th century is not isolated or separated from the German people. It is shared by many nameless comrades in exile (including you, my dear comrade in fate) and is meeting with a live response in the powerful movement of millions of people, which has spread among and inspired the entire people of the socialist Soviet Union, and which has become ideologically and organizationally widespread in many parts of the world. The question of my future fate should be considered only in accordance with these facts and in most close relation to the development of political and military events at the present stage of the war (to be discussed not at this point but later on, as a separate subject).

No one can predict what will happen to me or what could happen tomorrow or the day after! We cannot know if new privations and sufferings are in store for me, as has been frequently the case. Will I be set free without any conditions? No! I will not be released voluntarily, one can be sure of that. Furthermore, however terrible and sad it may be to mention this, it is likely that with the advance of the Soviet army, which is a serious threat to Germany, and the related worsening of Germany's overall military situation, the National Socialist regime will do everything possible to remove Thalmann as an individual from the ranks. Under such circumstances, the Hitlerite regime will not hesitate to remove Thalmann at the proper time from the political horizon or to liquidate him. The historically necessary self-aid alone could provide a different outcome which would benefit the entire revolutionary movement.

Two fighters, two fates, two incarcerated lives and two sad destinies, yet, at the same time, by virtue of common thoughts and objectives, two like-minded people loyal to the socialist ideal. It is true that common experience in prison brings people closer to each other. The feeling of such a tie exists between the two of us as well. However, it has become even deeper and stronger thanks to the unity of our views, albeit through a written exchange of our ideas. Whatever life you may lead in the future, the prerequisites for your behavior rest in your character. We have looked at one another in the face, in our hearts and even in our characters, although we have not met in person. In his play "Torquato Tasso," Goethe says that "talent is shaped in peace, and character in the storms of life."<sup>11</sup> In his novel "The



Apprenticeship of Wilhelm Meister," Goethe says: "Man's story shows his character."<sup>12</sup> In our common speech as well, the term "a person with character" means that this person has experienced something significant and has been tempered by his experiences, that there is in him something firm on which we can rely. The word "personality" comes from the word "person" and expresses something essential in man, something more than his appearance. From way back and to this day we mean by personality the type of person in whom there is something greater and more significant. Occasionally the word "personality" is used as a general description of character and the totality of spiritual manifestations of a person. Therefore, the word "personality" should always be applied to the type of person who rises above the ordinary and who dedicates all his efforts to serving his people. This purposefulness of character is a prerequisite for the qualities of a progressive personality, for the value and scale of the personality depend on the character. Where does the greatness of character lie? In the fact that at all times the individual invests his entire being in the implementation of ideas, in attaining a supreme objective, in the fact that the personality takes up a cause for its own sake. The story of our life is harsh, for which reason it demands people who have dedicated themselves entirely to the cause. You, I and all of our fellow fighters for our great cause must be strong, firm, ready for battle and confident in the future. For to be a soldier of the revolution means to preserve one's unflinching loyalty to the cause, a firmness which is proved by life and death; it means to display reliability, confidence, courage and energy in the struggle, whatever the circumstances. Let the fire which burns in us, which inflames our hearts and illuminates our spirit like a bright beacon, lead us in the battlefields of our life.

It is only by showing loyalty and firmness and strength of character and confidence in victory, it is only thus that we shall be able to conquer our fate, to fulfill our revolutionary duty in the great historical mission assigned to us and to make a contribution to the final victory of true socialism.

I am loyal to this thought! The years of life  
Have not been wasted, I can clearly see  
The end conclusion of earthly wisdom:  
Worthy of life and freedom is only he,  
Who goes into battle for them every single day!<sup>13</sup>

Revolutionary greetings. Your loyal fellow fighter in the struggle for socialism and firm comrade in fate.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. There is scant information on the person whose letter Thalmann answered. Copies obtained from him secretly and readdressed to Thalmann make clear that his name was Hans Joachim Lehmann. He was arrested by the Hitlerites as a very young man and spent some 10 years in Nazi jails. According to Rosa, Thalmann's wife, after the defeat of fascist Germany, the severely ill, bed-ridden Lehmann lived in Leipzig, where he worked on his recollections on the final period of Thalmann's prison life. Having completed this project, Lehmann took off for Berlin with his manuscript



which he intended to deliver to Rosa Thalmann. Along the way, the suitcase in which he had put the manuscript was stolen. Lehmann died shortly afterwards.

2. A prison near Hamburg.
3. R. Scheringer and G. Ludin were officers stationed at the Ulm Garrison. They had engaged in clandestine Nazi activities as members of the Reichswehr since 1929. In the spring of 1930, they were arrested and that same autumn sentenced to jail by the Imperial Court. In the course of talks with communist prisoners in the Holnow Fortress, and after reading the works of Marx and V. I. Lenin, Scheringer began to realize that the then-anticapitalist programmatic slogans of the Nazi party were nothing but social demagogy. In the spring of 1931, having become firmly convinced of this as a result of talks with Goebbels and Hitler, Scheringer officially broke with the Nazis and joined the communist party. In the summer of 1932, Scheringer was given another prison sentence by the Imperial Court for his actions in support of the communist cause. After the seizure of power by the Hitlerites he found himself in a fascist jail. Scheringer was in the ranks of the West German communist movement after the war. His books provide an interesting description of his career. Scheringer is a noted leader of the German communist party and member of its Board.
4. DIE ROTE FAHNE ("Red Flag") was a newspaper and central organ of the Communist Party of Germany (1918-1939).
5. A paraphrase of the scornful answer which the knight Goetz von Berliingen gave to the enemy's demand to surrender, in Goethe's tragedy "Goetz von Berliingen With the Iron Hand": "Surrender? To anger and mercy? Who are you talking to? Who do you think I am, a bandit? Let your commander try...." (J. W. Goethe, "Sobr. Soch." [Collected Works]. In 10 volumes. Vol 4. Moscow, 1977, p 68).
6. The Saar area is in the southwestern part of Germany; it was part of Germany until 1919. After Germany's defeat in World War I, France laid a claim to the area. According to the Versailles Peace Treaty the area became a separate political-geographic entity governed by the League of Nations for 15 years. A plebiscite (nationwide vote) was held in the Saar District in 1935, as a result of which it became part of Germany.
7. A question mark in the text of Thalmann's letter.
8. J. W. Goethe, op. cit., vol 10, Moscow, 1980, p 156.
9. I.e., in the Bautzen Prison to which Thalmann was transferred in August 1943.
10. As in the text of Thalmann's letter. His daughter Irma saw her father for the last time in September 1943. According to Rosa Thalmann's memoirs, her last meeting with her husband was in February 1944.

11. J. W. Goethe, op. cit., vol 5, Moscow, 1977, p 216.
12. Ibid., vol 7, Moscow, 1978, p 364.
13. J. W. Goethe. "Faustus," part II (translated by N. A. Kholodkovskiy). Moscow-Leningrad, 1936, pp 297-298.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1820/5

WHO DESTROYED TRUST AND WHEN? ON THE SUBJECT OF AN UNKNOWN LETTER BY NIELS BOHR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84) pp 106-108

[Article by V. Mal'kov, doctor of historical sciences]

[Text] The Soviet Union has always ascribed exceptionally great importance to strengthening trust in international relations. However, there can be no trust without reciprocity, without the confidence that one's partner is not playing a double game, sinking to base cheating and dissembling. Yet our country has all the proper reasons to doubt the sincerity of the United States and its NATO allies. In this connection, it would be useful to recall the past.

From the very start of the nuclear age, arrogant scorn for the interests of other countries, the Soviet Union above all, and reliance on the fact that, possessing the secrets of the atom, and assuming "ordering" police functions in world affairs and the right to dictate their will on other nations were characteristic of the United States and England. The categorical refusal of the U.S. and British ruling circles to take into consideration the universal aspect of the nuclear problem and the perfectly clear manifestation of their desire to use their advance in having mastered the "secret" of nuclear weapons as a means of threatening and pressuring the Soviet Union, are the sources of the most severe crisis in relations among the allies, which directly preceded the cold war unleashed by imperialism. Not only the hundreds of thousands of people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki but also the hopes of strengthening trust in the postwar world were the victims of the first atom bombs--the most barbaric act in the history of U.S. imperialism.

It is noteworthy that at the threshold of the nuclear era, the best scientists, those who contributed the most to the discovery of this new source of energy through their knowledge, talent and efforts, not only raised their voice in defense of agreements on banning the atomic weapon and establishing efficient international control over it, but also insisted on the drafting of specific principles which would regulate on an equal footing relations among the great powers which already had nuclear weapons or could produce them. They believed that any effort to avoid this in the hope of assuming the monopoly was immoral and highly irresponsible.

Niels Bohr, the noted Danish physicist, was one of the first who realized, even before the appearance of nuclear weapons, that the world could be protected from this new mass destruction means only by the power of trust, honest dialogue and willingness to resolve problems related to its production and control, in a spirit of equal cooperation and mutual understanding. One could become confused seeing how mercilessly and cynically the fine threads of agreement were being broken in pursuit of illusory omnipotence. Bohr, who had participated in the work on the first atom bombs during his stay in the United States in 1943-1945 and who was concerned by the clearly manifested intention on the part of Washington and London to conceal from the Soviet Union the very fact that such a weapon was being developed, justifiably considered this behavior by the two powers a dishonest and treacherous undermining of the principle of coordinated actions by the allies in the anti-Hitlerite coalition and, consequently, a rather dangerous challenge to a future world without suffering and destruction.

The incompatibility of such behavior with elementary rules of respectability was absolutely obvious to Bohr: for secrecy in this matter is justified when it applies to the enemy but intolerable in the case of an ally. It was his profound conviction that such a position could not withstand criticism, for it placed the USSR and its partners under unequal conditions and triggered rivalry in manufacturing a mass destruction weapon, which was blocking the way to a "harmonious cooperation among nations" and to achieving universal security in the face of the tremendous power of destruction (see Niels Bohr, "Izbrannyye Nauchnyye Trudy" [Selected Scientific Works]. In two volumes. Vol 2, Moscow, 1971, p 377; R. Moore. "Niels Bohr--Chelovek i Uchenyy" [Niels Bohr--Man and Scientist]. Moscow, 1969, pp 358, 385).

Bohr was disturbed by another aspect of the problem as well. Better than most people, he realized that the hopes of the Soviet Union would fall behind in the scientific and technical area, promoted by anti-Soviet fanatics in the United States and Britain, did not rest on solid grounds. The scientist was aware of the absurdity of such an illusion. He predicted the inevitable failure of the policy of nuclear blackmail and urged the formulation of a "new approach to the problem of international relations as a whole" (Niels Bohr, op. cit., vol II, p 377). He deemed necessary that the USSR be kept informed on all major aspects related to the development of this weapon. He was in favor of making an open statement that the United States and Britain did not consider its possession a means of exerting pressure in interallied relations (see Martin J. Sherwin. "A World Destroyed. The Atomic Bomb and the Grand Alliance." New York, 1977, pp 92, 96).

In the spring of 1944 Bohr was able to present his considerations to Roosevelt. The reaction of the president was vague. He advised Bohr to go to London and talk to Churchill and to elucidate his viewpoint on contacts with the Soviet Union in connection with the work on nuclear weapons and international control over them. Such a meeting was held on 16 May 1944 but ended in total failure. Churchill rejected bluntly and most categorically the idea of a resolution of the nuclear problem jointly and in coordination with the USSR. Discouraged, Bohr returned to Washington and requested a personal meeting with the American president.

In preparing himself for the meeting, which had been scheduled for 26 August 1944, Bohr wanted to make his arguments maximally convincing, for which purpose he presented them as a memorandum, the main idea of which was expressed with extreme clarity: any monopoly on nuclear weapons is a purely temporary phenomenon and any attempt at preserving it and concealing from the Soviet Union information on the project under way would inevitably blow up the trust which had developed within the anti-Hitlerite coalition and could lead to a fatal nuclear arms race. The talk with the president was held in the White House, as scheduled, and dealt precisely with this problem. President Roosevelt let it be understood that he agreed with Bohr on the need for talks with the USSR (see R. Moore, op. cit., p 387; L. V. Pozdeyeva. "Anglo-Amerikanskiye Otnosheniya v Gody Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny 1941-1945 Gg." [Anglo-American Relations During World War II, 1941-1945]. Moscow, 1969, p 184; D. Danin, "Niels Bohr." Moscow, 1978, p 503; Martin J. Sherwin, op. cit., p 109).

The hope seemed reborn that the temptation of turning the separately developed nuclear weapon into a means of diplomatic threat and military blackmail would not become the leading principle in Western policy. Roosevelt was scheduled to meet with Churchill in Quebec in September 1944, and his promise to discuss the nuclear problem in the spirit of the ideas formulated in the course of his conversation with Bohr gave the impression that the crack which had appeared in relations between the Allies would not be allowed to widen into a precipice, and that the trust which had developed in the course of the joint struggle against fascism would be strengthened.

At the risk of nagging, on 7 September 1944 Bohr wrote another letter to Roosevelt in which he reminded him of the responsibility of the leaders of the United States and Britain for preserving and strengthening mutual understanding among the leading powers in the anti-Hitlerite coalition, which was a most important prerequisite for any future order in the world, based on the principle of peaceful coexistence. To this day, 40 years later, this letter remains relevant. The scientist who, after his meeting with Churchill had become more cautious, presented in a less obvious but quite clear form his thoughts on the near-sightedness of relying on any scientific and technical lagging on the part of the Soviet Union and the danger of being blinded by the mania of military superiority. It is in this context that Bohr's 7 September letter, essentially ignored by biographers and published here for the first time, is one more indisputable historical proof of the mercenary-minded nature with which the Western circles approached the question of trust at a crucial time for humankind.

Bohr's efforts, which involved a great deal of personal risk, failed to yield any positive result. The U.S. and British leaders categorically rejected Bohr's suggestion of exchanging information with the Soviet Union on work in the area of atomic energy in the course of their confidential meeting and in a specially drafted secret document, dated 19 September 1944, thus creating, as the scientist presumed, prerequisites for the aggravation of the crisis of trust in interallied relations. Furthermore, the document which was adopted in that session contained unproved accusations against Bohr. The last item of the memorandum read as follows: "We insist on conducting an investigation on

Professor Bohr's activities; we must be sure that he bears no responsibility for the leak of information, particularly to the Russians" (quoted from R. Moore, op. cit., p 390; see also Martin J. Sherwin, op. cit., p 284).

History has proved the great harm which was done to the cause of postwar cooperation, as a result of secret efforts on the part of certain U.S. and British circles to base relations with the socialist countries not on the principle of mutual trust, which Bohr mentioned, but on the principles of diktat and power pressure.

Today the rulers of the United States, Britain and many other NATO countries are once again relying on achieving absolute military superiority over the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries by accelerating the production of new types of weapons. The lesson, as the people say, did no good!

The original of the letter which Niels Bohr sent to U.S. President Roosevelt on 7 September 1944 is part of the Robert Oppenheimer papers (U.S. Library of Congress, manuscripts section).

Washington, 7 September 1944

Dear Mr President:

I wish to thank you with all my heart for the honor and trust you have given me by receiving and talking with me on the tremendously important vital problem of interest to you, related to the latest extraordinary accomplishments in the physical sciences.

The forthcoming prospect for the release of tremendous quantities of energy by splitting the atom, made possible with the advanced work done in the United States, will unquestionably have a profound influence on the future of mankind. However, as you noted with full justification, the bright hopes triggered by this miraculous discovery could be darkened by the most sinister threats to the safety of mankind unless an international agreement is drafted at the proper time on effective control over this new horrible weapon.

The activities of the responsible state leaders, who realize the importance of this problem, must be subordinated to achieving this great objective. As a physicist, who has had the honor to be most closely involved with the latest research, I am deeply grateful to you for the opportunity to present to you some considerations relative to the technical aspects of this great enterprise, bearing in mind, in particular, the question of control and organization of similar efforts in other countries.

In this case, the fact should be taken into consideration that as a result of fruitful international scientific cooperation, the principle on the basis of which high quantities of energy can be released from the split nucleus of the atom were essentially known even before the war, thus being a common achievement of physicists the world over.

It is equally well known that preparatory work had been undertaken in several different countries and although it may seem obvious that American-British

efforts have outstripped the efforts of others, any information on success in this work in the United States, scant though it might have been, would most rapidly trigger the acceleration of similar efforts everywhere. Fortunately, the course of the war eliminated any threat of the military use of such purposeful efforts on the part of Germany. We must remember, however, that after Germany's defeat it may be assumed that all special knowledge and technical experience acquired in that country will become equally available to all victorious great powers.

Under such circumstances, personal relations among scientists, which had been established in the course of cooperation before the war, may prove to be quite useful in formulating (while observing all secrecy rules) an understanding of the high stakes, should the expected results of studies in the area of atomic physics materialized, and in making preparations for the full utilization of the tremendous advantages which honest cooperation and the practical implementation of effective control measures could bring about.

I am grateful to you for the warm reception you gave me and for your expressed wish to meet with me once again later. It goes without saying that it will be a happy honor for me to accept your invitation.

Very respectfully,

Niels Bohr

To the President of the United States

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/5



## 'WAR ALARM' IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84) pp 109-110

[Article by V. Nekrasov]

[Text] The "war alarm" signals, which have been a constant companion of the history of international relations in our century, are once again being heard over the world. This time, they are coming out of Central America. A terrible and real danger of invasion by American imperialism, which is trying to suppress with an iron fist any opposition to the diktat of moneybags in the Western Hemisphere, is hanging on Nicaragua, a small Latin American republic, whose people have dared to take their fate in their own hands in opposition to the diktat of U.S. monopoly capital.

For a number of years the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua, which made the land and the other national wealth the property of the people and restored to them their feeling of dignity and self-respect, and which, to the extent of its possibilities, is concerned with rapidly developing health care, education and culture, has been the subject of the heaviest possible pressure. From the territory of neighboring countries, the forces of imperialist reaction are waging undeclared war on the Nicaraguan people. The year 1984 alone was marked by crimes, "outstanding" even against the background of excesses committed by the gangs of "contras" and their North American masters, such as mining the republic's sea ports or the now-public CIA "special manual" on waging terrorist activities on the soil of an independent state.

However, despite their casualties and privations, the Nicaraguan people's masses have not faltered. They have endured. Meanwhile, Washington's intentions of depicting the situation in the country as being allegedly a civil war between Nicaraguans, have failed. In the 4 November 1984 elections the republic's citizens convincingly proved on what side their sympathy and support lay. More than 80 percent of all registered voters participated in the most democratic elections in the country's history, as unanimously acknowledged by foreign observers; 67 percent voted for the candidates of the Sandinista National Liberation Front. Has there ever been such an impressive manifestation of people's unanimity in the United States itself? Never!

The dirty efforts to wreck the general elections of an independent country, made by Washington, failed. Enraged by this failure, immediately after the elections, the American reaction drastically energized military provocations against Nicaragua, clearly trying to create a pretext for expanding the intervention against its affairs.

During that period, the international public witnessed an unprecedented increase in American military power in Central America. The development of events is continuing as this article is being written. What turn will they take in the immediate future? Will it be a full-scale invasion of Nicaraguan soil by American interventionists? Will its peaceful cities be bombed or will there be a naval blockade, preceding aggression on land? Whatever the case, from the military viewpoint the intervention machinery has been prepared. The question is only whether the order to put it in motion will be given, and if so, when?

Naturally, it is not excluded that the extensive worldwide publicity of Washington's military preparations and the exploding of the indignation of the international public they triggered would force the interventionists to delay their open invasion. Unquestionably, however, this will not make them drop their plans. The foreign press is reporting a variety of "military and diplomatic pressure," on Managua, currently being considered by the various agencies in Washington. The essential factor, however, is obvious: the Pentagon militarists are only seeking a pretext and a convenient time to try to suppress the Sandinista revolution by military means.

Despite all the differences in the situation, we cannot fail to note the parallel between Washington's current activities and the situation which developed in connection with last year's invasion by the American military of the small island republic of Grenada. Incidentally, in their evaluation of the development of events, some senior U.S. officials are making a point of drawing such parallels.

In any case, already today, as was the case during the period of aggression against Grenada, the ridiculous groundlessness of the pretexts on which this hysterical anti-Nicaraguan campaign which is being promoted along all official and unofficial channels by Washington's propaganda organs, is noteworthy. Yesterday, it was a case of reports on imaginary deliveries of Soviet jet fighters to Nicaragua which, it is claimed, threatened the security of the Western hemisphere--reports which were literally laughed off the world over. Today this involves fabricated claims that the Sandinista army was preparing to attack neighboring Honduras and El Salvador. No sensible person could conceive of a greater absurdity: according to the Pentagon's version, a small nation in a hostile surrounding, repelling bandit attacks on its homeland for several years, turns out to be preparing itself for aggression against regimes which are under the special protection of American imperialism. As M. D'Escoto, the Nicaraguan minister of foreign affairs, justifiably noted, such actions would be the equivalent of "presenting Washington on a silver platter the pretext it is seeking for attacking Nicaragua." But what do Washington's propagandists care about common sense, if their lies find a nutritive ground in the American petit bourgeois?

What matters most, naturally, is not the pretext but the real danger which threatens the revolutionary gains of a Latin American nation. The progressive circles the world over and simply soberly thinking people fully realize what is in fact happening in Central America. They can see that it is a question of the Pentagon's intentions of keeping this area in the sights of their weapons, as it tried, although unsuccessfully, to do in the Middle East, in Lebanon, not so long ago. It is a question of dangerous provocations, the purpose of which is not simply "to test" the reaction of world public opinion to the next escalation of the notorious American-style "total permissiveness" but also to accustom it to the idea of the effectiveness of such actions and their inevitability in the future. It is a question of an attempt to threaten with a fist, yet once again, all liberation movements on earth.

There is no such thing as someone else's trouble to internationalists and to all people of good will. The cause of the Nicaraguan people is close to the heart of hundreds of millions of people on earth. The peaceloving forces in the different continents are clearly aware of the threat to universal peace created by the bloody exercises of the American military in one area or another. The current outbreak of militaristic hysteria has a particular underlining, which closely relates it in time with repeated White House assertions of its desire to follow a more constructive line in the international arena and seek a peaceful and mutually acceptable solution of existing problems. The question is this: What should the rest of the world believe: such assertions or the recent claims made by the U.S. secretary of state concerning his country's alleged "right" to carry out military strikes, including "preventive" strikes, against countries arbitrarily classified by Washington as "terrorist?"

The "war alarm," organized in Central America by militarists on the banks of the Potomac, can be fully classified as such an action. What makes it even more fraught with dangerous consequences, as reported by the American press, is that the Pentagon's computers have already estimated possible U.S. casualties in the case of an aggression against Nicaragua and determined them acceptable.

It is quite noteworthy that the militaristic hysteria promoted by the American mass information media is not deprived of a very tangible aftertaste of uncertainty and of looking over one's shoulder. It is as though its organizers ask themselves the following: Would events in Central America not bring major unpleasantness to Washington if we continue to move in this direction? The loudness of cries of the "threat to the national security" of the United States and the realities of the situation are quite incommensurate. Everything would probably have looked different had the American capital been convinced of its ability to deal a lightning-fast, crushing blow and, losing no time, proclaim a new "great" victory over the enemies of the "shining city on the mount," as Washington's propaganda describes the United States. It is entirely obvious, however, that no such conviction exists. Whatever may be said or written in the United States on the topic of surmounting the "Vietnam syndrome," it is unquestionable that the lessons from the defeat inflicted upon the imperialist aggressor by the heroic people of Vietnam will remain an open sore in American public opinion.

"Nicaragua is preparing to repel any threat," said Daniel Ortega, the elected president of the republic, speaking for his people. Yes, as incoming reports confirm, the Nicaraguan people are ready to defend their revolution. Managua's approach to the existing situation, the strength of the domestic popular front and the solidarity of all progressive and peace-loving forces of mankind with it, are characterized by a combination of firmness and defense of principles and flexibility in political practice. All of this forces the American imperialists to go slowly and maneuver and, in the final account, should force them to think deeply about the most serious consequences which a new piratical act committed by them could have to the United States itself.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/5

## HONOR AND GLORY ACCORDING TO LABOR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84) pp 111-115

[Letter to the editors by Yu. Shcherbakov, head of a complex-combined brigade and member of the party committee of the Elektrostal'tyazhmash Production Association, Elektrostal, Moscow Oblast]

[Text] I hesitated before writing you. I pondered, analyzed the matter and thought. I finally realized that I had to express my thoughts, for I was quite affected by Comrade K. U. Chernenko's words at the All-Union Conference of People's Controllers. Speaking of observing the sacred socialist principle "From each according to his capabilities and to each according to his work," Konstantin Ustinovich pointed out that "...although aware of the entire greatness of this accomplishment, we must not forget the fact that it must be protected and developed. We have sufficient experience to tell us that observing the principle 'according to the work' demands particular concern, for otherwise violations would be committed, violations which cause great harm to our economy, as well as violations which provoke the profound indignation of the Soviet people and do not fit in our concept of justice."

It is hardly necessary to prove the pleasure and satisfaction which a job performed smoothly, with total dedication of one's efforts and skill brings to all of us. The first prerequisite on which, in my opinion, successful work depends is the conscience of a person, the degree of his conscientiousness, his understanding of public duty, great interest in everything around him and the aspiration to "burn" rather than "smolder." These are the main prerequisites for a rich life and human happiness. All the rest, as the saying goes, will come about--an excellent mood, the respect of the collective and sufficiency at home.

In our Elektrostal'tyazhmash Production Association, which is mainly engaged in the manufacturing of one-of-a-kind rolled metal equipment for the metallurgical industry, efforts are made above all to find an individual approach to the heart of the person and to promote an honest and conscientious attitude toward labor. A variety of educational means are used to this effect. Here are two examples.

Five years ago, P. K. Lavrenkov (who has worked at the association for more than 20 years) set up at the second machine assembly shop a Komsomol youth brigade consisting of recent graduates of vocational technical schools in Moscow Oblast. Pavel Kirillovich encouraged in the young people the desire to upgrade their professional skills and their self-assertion. He helped them in determining their own potential. The collective included boys who had not only low skills but low moral features as well. Lavrenkov established contacts with their families and even visited and talked to the parents of the most difficult among them. They frequently corresponded. Some fathers and mothers visited Elektrostal to see the way their boys were living. It was thus that reciprocal control was achieved. This yielded good results. Brigade membership was stable. After army service, as a rule, the boys returned to their collective. They liked not only the earnings but the atmosphere of friendly participation and mutual understanding and the prevailing moral and psychological climate. Unexpectedly at one point a distressed Pavel Kirillovich went to the party committee to report that the brigade had proclaimed a silent boycott against him. The party members had to determine the nature of these complex relations and talk to the people and the chairman of the brigade council, headed by V. I. Povprits, a respected tool operator. A meeting was held several days later, so that the people would stop whispering behind the brigade leader's back and say directly, as workers should, whatever they thought about their leader. It turned out that Lavrenkov, whose picture was permanently exhibited on the honor board, and who had been repeatedly written about in the newspapers, had become conceited. He considered himself infallible, was unwilling to listen to other people's opinions and began occasionally to go home before the end of the working day. Such errors were strictly pointed out to Pavel Kirillovich, who realized that the moral right to head a collective must not only be earned but always reasserted, so that no one could ever insult him by saying, "Who do you think you are?"

One year ago Ye. M. Aulov, a worker, bearer of the Labor Red Banner Order and party committee bureau member, suggested that a brigade consisting of "arrant" people be set up in the modeling shop. He addressed them as follows: "Boys, who would like to join? Good people are not invited." A collective was formed consisting exclusively of labor discipline violators. It was decided to watch what Yevgeniy Mikhaylovich would do with them. Naturally, the brigade members themselves were fed up with being classified as absenteeists: they agreed that they would allow no friends to wait for them at the gate and that there would be no more scandals. Aulov tried to approach everyone individually. He took a variety of steps of educational, moral and material importance and established close contacts with their families. Matters went so far that on payday he asked their wives to come to the shop and receive their husbands' wages. The brigade members felt insulted after a couple of such occasions. They would go to the brigade leader, saying that "for the past 2 months I have not violated the discipline. Could you relieve me from this kind of slavery? Let me feel that I am the family breadwinner..." He gave them this opportunity. If someone failed, he applied the system anew. What happened? The brigade is doing good work and although occasional breakdowns do occur, the main thing is that the workers have begun to lead a normal working life and have once again felt themselves needed by their families, bringing home not 100 but 200 or more rubles. These are not 17-

year-old youngsters but 40- to 50-year-old adults. Just try to reeducate them. Yet Aulov was able to find a suitable approach to them. Incidentally, he could have set up a brigade of people causing no trouble. Guided by his party conscience, however, he voluntarily assumed this heavy burden.

Naturally, exclusively educational measures are insufficient. I know from personal experience that an efficient organization of the work and eliminating wage equalization contribute to the successful struggle against lack of discipline, slackness and negligence. "The trend toward equalization," Comrade K. U. Chernenko said at the All-Union Conference of People's Controllers, "is a trend toward benefitting parasites and waste makers, while at the same time insulting and harming the good and conscientious worker." This is a very just statement! I am deeply convinced that appealing to the conscience, persuading and calling upon moneygrubbers, idlers, waste makers and absenteeists to work well is not enough. We must create the type of conditions under which they would be simply unable to work slowly and poorly. They themselves would be unwilling to do this. This, however, is possible above all with the brigade form of labor organization, a strict consideration of individual contributions to the common project and just material and moral rewards.

Let us take our brigade as an example. Its work sector is one of the most important in the association. We machine the main assemblies of one-of-a-kind equipment and parts weighing as much as 75 tons for pipe rolling and welding machine tools (the entire postwar pipe-manufacturing industry is essentially equipped with such machine tools). Sometimes the processing cycle may exceed a full month. Any breakdown could reduce to naught the efforts of hundreds of people. This requires maximal coordination and mutual aid and reciprocal supervision, which promotes the desire and need to work honestly, to be aware of one's social duty and to be disciplined.

The brigade has 30 members (including eight party and 12 Komsomol members). In my view, the collective is a good blend of experienced workers and beginners. We have comrades who have worked at the association for more than 30 years, such as party member drill operator D. D. Kochnov, bearer of the Orders of Lenin and October Revolution. We also have many young people under 30, who are very experienced and highly skilled. Let me cite among them the young party members S. M. Zenukhin and A. N. Laponogov, who are among the most skilled bore operators in the shop and who joined us as apprentices.

Everything in the brigade--equipment, tools and, above all, experience--is shared. Usually the individual workers perform the operations they have mastered best of all. However, considering the one-of-a-kind nature of the work, the load of the machine tools is necessarily uneven. That is why 13 members have mastered two or more skills. Bearing in mind the existing situation, this enables us rapidly to "transfer" people to machining, drilling or milling operations, to increase equipment load and upgrade the shift coefficient. The order is issued to the brigade as a whole. Wages and bonuses do not depend on the number of workers, their grade or wage rate. The full earned amount goes into a common "kettle." The brigade council decides on their just distribution. Our output cannot be estimated in terms of the number of parts. That is why the basic indicator of the labor participation



coefficient (KTU) is the number of norm/hours of the individual worker. The brigade itself is in charge of this strict accounting. This enables us to avoid any depersonalization of labor and prevents idlers from hiding behind the backs of others.

All wages and bonuses, virtually ignoring the members' grade, are paid on the basis of the KTU, for we have skillful workers who, because of inadequate theoretical training, cannot earn a grade promotion. Conversely, boys and girls come to us from vocational technical schools with a third-grade rating on graduation and who, after quickly passing their theory examinations, are further promoted in grade. However, their skill frequently remains low and their attitude toward the work is not always conscientious. What matters, actually, is not the grade but the actual individual contribution--the produced norm/hours (naturally, taking into consideration the attitude toward the work, labor discipline and other factors). It may turn out, therefore, that a second-grade worker may earn 250-300 rubles while a fifth-grade worker, only 200. This, we believe, is just.

The KTU of the individual worker is not amended immediately after the results of the monthly work have become known, for virtually always the pieces must be redone, which creates the problem of "profitable" and "unprofitable" types of work. However carefully the norm may have been set, it is impossible to predict whether or not the metal ingot will be sufficiently hard, what will the allowances turn out to be, etc. Therefore, if a person has not worked out the necessary number of norm/hours, the brigade will consider the fact calmly. It will look closely and thoroughly determine the reasons. It is only when a persistent worsening or improvement of results has become apparent over a period of several months that the KTU will be changed. Are there malcontents in such cases? Occasionally, yes. This is entirely natural. A person may err but his comrades could see better from the outside. The complete lack of reprimands may be an indication that people are unwilling to be principle-minded.

The KTU is a factor not only for purely material, but for moral influence as well. In itself, money is not the only and the absolute incentive. Looking at the problem more deeply, a moral influence exerted on a person would motivate him to work better. The workers are influenced by the very discussion of their KTU, which makes everyone look at himself as though from the outside, through the eyes of his comrades. The people care most of all not about the opinion of the administration but of the collective, to which they react quite sensitively.

Incidentally, we still frequently hear views according to which under the conditions of the new-type brigade purely individual competition is unnecessary, for the most important thing here is not rivalry but mutual aid and reciprocal guarantees. One could hardly agree with this, although, naturally, the organization of such competition within the brigade is quite different from the one in the past. Let us consider, for example, the labor rivalry for the title "Best in the Profession." Previously, the frontrunner was determined exclusively on the basis of the highest number of norm/hours worked. Naturally, professional skills are taken into consideration in the brigades as well. However, they are no longer the only self-sufficing factor.

The degree of conscientiousness, the creative approach to the work and the desire to help others are also taken into consideration. The best worker is the one who makes the greatest contribution to the common results. The results of the competition are summed up on the basis not only of output but of the KTU as well, the size of which depends both on professional skill and on work in related skills, labor activeness, sharing experience with comrades, etc. Therefore, the worker is rated not only on the basis of the production but, to a certain extent, also the social viewpoint. Every month the association names 20 winners per profession. I believe this to be correct, for alongside brigade competition, individual competition is necessary and should not be "filed away."

In my view, moral incentive accompanied by wide publicity and ceremony, creates in the recipients a feeling of legitimate pride and satisfaction and, in the others, the wish to follow their example. Even a valuable gift is not material aid but above all a mark of honor. It enhances the reputation of the person among his comrades, both in the shop and outside it. Furthermore, the "effect of the consequences" is of great importance in this respect. No one would discuss a bonus on the day following its presentation. A gift, however, can be displayed on all occasions.

Our association tries to encourage more intensive and conscientious work by combining moral with material incentives. In the first 9 months of this year 900 people were issued honor certificates; 444 received letters of thanks, the salaries of 173 were raised and 32 people were presented with valuable gifts. Every quarter some of the wage fund is saved in virtually all shops because of personnel shortages, and every quarter some 300 people receive wage supplements from this fund for combining professions and displaying professional skills and conscientious attitude toward their work. Those who have worked well are given priority in receiving passes for sanatoriums, rest homes, the Voskhod tourist base, the prophylactic establishment, etc. A great deal has been done of late for machine-tool operators working on three shifts. They are paid higher wages and given free food for working the night shift. They are given advantages in housing priorities: half a year is added to each year of actual work.

Starting with this year, Elektrostal'tyazhmash has been a participant in the broad economic experiment. The collective is working under difficult conditions (no more than 5 to 10 percent of its output consists of the same items) and is still not fulfilling all contractual obligations. Yet, during the first half of the year we were granted three "beneficial" percentages for procurement shortfalls, and 1.5 percent during the second. Starting with 1985, we must fulfill our procurement plan in full. This is a difficult assignment, particularly bearing in mind that the number of workers with different skills is consistently below the plan figure in the association. In particular, the enterprise should have more than of 1,000 machine tool operators, yet 10 percent of such jobs remain vacant. We also have cases of equipment idling, intrashift working time losses and absenteeism.

The association is always on the lookout for new forms of material and moral labor incentives for the workers, in the light of the new requirements. The party committee bureau supported the initiative of N. A. Kechin's brigade at

the Fifth Machine Assembly Shop: to organize a competition under the slogan "Fulfill the Contract on Time With Highest Possible Productivity and Minimal Outlays." Criteria are currently being formulated for assessing its results. Naturally, the degree of implementation of contractual obligations will be one of the indicators. Without going into detail, let me mention the additional incentive to the brigade (as of 1 October 1984, experimental), which helps to implement stressed plans and contractual obligations.

If a brigade voluntarily undertakes to carry out an additional assignment in order to meet contractual stipulations in full, its collective is awarded a 1 percent bonus (in addition to the 40 percent allowed in accordance with the existing regulation for a normally stressed plan) for each percentage of plan increase. In other words, not only wage earnings but the bonus itself is increased. Furthermore, if a complex brigade either has no auxiliary personnel or is short of such personnel, and the collective itself assumes its duties, it is awarded the entire amount (rather than part of it) which should have been paid to the auxiliary workers. This bonus system is now being applied in the procurement shops which lack complete sets of steel and cast iron ingots, castings or welded structures. On the other hand, if the worker produces items not currently needed for the fulfillment of contractual obligations, such items are accepted and paid for but do not entitle him to a bonus. This represents a combination of administrative measures and economic methods.

Our council of brigade leaders has begun to work more energetically. In the past it was headed by a worker from the 10th Machine Assembly Shop, one of the first promoters of collective forms of labor organization, a person who enjoyed the great respect of the collective. It turned out, however, that this person lacked organizational talent, the necessary initiative and ability to rally public opinion and actively to participate in the solution of practical problems. The current chairman of the council is Hero of Socialist Labor turner L. A. D'yachenko. The council is now becoming a real coordinating center for the development of collective forms of labor organization and has already drawn attention to itself. Meeting procedures and agenda items are no longer determined by the NOT [Scientific Organization of Labor] service. Lev Aleksandrovich, who is familiar with the "sore spots" of the production process, receives many ideas and suggestions from the other members of the collective. He draws up the agenda together with the NOT service. A great variety of items are discussed, dealing with the organization of labor, wages, the condition of the tools, equipment loads, observance of labor and technological discipline, etc. Problems are considered and resolved sometimes also on the level of Ye. S. Smelov, the association's general director, who meets with D'yachenko and other brigade leaders every Monday.

In conclusion, let us discuss a vital problem, such as strengthening labor discipline. All the honest people are already fed up with the disorderly behavior and irresponsibility of some so-called workers and the spirit of total forgiveness displayed toward them. In our association, the subunit managers were strictly warned that should they cover for absenteeists or fail to take proper and, above all, prompt measures, this could be considered a violation of their duty. A strict record of absenteeists is kept. Every day,

before production problems are discussed at short meetings attended by the shop chief, his deputies, senior foremen, foremen and party organizers, the names of violators are read aloud. The comrade courts have energized their work. At such courts not only is the dislike of violators expressed but angry indignation as well at those who prevent us from living and working normally. Unfortunately, some of us have not abandoned their indifferent attitude. If no more than the chairman or a foreman speak out at a comrade court, while the others remain silent ("let someone else speak"), the usefulness of such a trial remains low: a person may even feel unfairly insulted. If everyone would speak out, even a conceited culprit would realize the nature of his action, and would necessarily draw some conclusion. The names of labor discipline violators are posted on the bulletin board of the individual shops and the steps which were taken are listed (penalties, full or partial deprivation of monthly bonus or of the "13th" wage, postponement of annual leave for the wintertime, loss of housing priority, transfer to lower-paid work, etc.).

Nevertheless, compared with the first 9 months of last year, during the first 9 months of this year the number of lost man/days...increased. The main reason is that stricter records are kept on those who abuse the trust of the collective. The second reason, in my view, if we are to look at truth in the eyes, is that malicious violators of labor discipline (at enterprises short of manpower) have found loopholes in the newly passed laws. Actually, if someone is a shirker he would not be frightened by a postponement of his paid leave to the winter: he can perfectly well be absent during the summer as well. What about being deprived of his "13th" wage? He does not get it as it were. Loss of housing priority? It is all the same to him, for he does not expect to obtain housing in the foreseeable future. An effective step is transfer to lower-paid work for 3 months without the right to resign. Absenteeists fear this measure greatly. Loading workers earn between 170 and 180 rubles; demoted to auxiliary workers, they lose approximately 100 rubles. This is a substantial loss. But how can this sanction be applied to machine tool workers, for we are already short of them?

Therefore, the steps taken to strengthen labor discipline "operate" only for those who work more or less decently. Malicious absenteeists and drunks (it is true that their percentage in our association is small) remain untouched. Furthermore, some short-sighted managers protect and go soft on them: what if a drunk loafs around a machine tool for a couple of weeks? In any case there is no one else to take over. But how to educate the young people, if truants are forgiven everything? Sometimes a worker would be fired from a shop and the cadre department would give him a job in a neighboring subunit. Such people flutter like butterflies.

But when a person is fired by the association, even with the permission of the trade union committee and the administration, the employment bureau will send him right back to us (the other enterprises in Elektrostal are basically fully staffed). This undermines the authority of the labor collective, for a dismissal is used as an extreme measure, when everything else has been tried, the inveterate drunk has made the full round several times, and when nothing else has helped.

I believe that the brigade itself must decide who to fire and who to hire. I believe that such democracy is a mandatory prerequisite for economic management. Whatever the reasons given, any limitations of this right conflict with the nature of the new-type brigades.

"The ineffectiveness of steps which have been taken for a number of years against alcohol abuse," K. U. Chernenko has said, "is a matter of serious concern. Addiction to alcohol dooms healthy people and brings trouble at home. Drunkenness causes substantial harm to production and, in general, casts an aspersion on our way of life. Clearly, the time has come to take more persistent and better-planned actions with a view to freeing society from this major evil."

Let me illustrate the relevance of this statement with the following examples.

We have a loading worker who has repeatedly been fired from the shop and the association. The last time this occurred, a year and a half ago, he was sent back to work. The collective unanimously refused to accept him. Being a literate person (a technicum graduate), he wrote a letter to the first gorkom secretary, complaining that he was being blocked, that he wanted to work and was a skilled specialist who was being pushed into becoming a parasite. The gorkom sent an instructor to investigate and urgently recommended that the person be hired. The next morning, on his way to work, the instructor saw the same person near a bar. "What is the matter?" "I decided to go to work tomorrow." The same occurred on the following day. In a word, this so-called loading worker was kicked out again. He remained unemployed for more than 1 year and served a term for parasitism. Then, once again through the employment bureau, he was assigned to the association, to our brigade. We accepted him. He worked for a month until payday, after which he did not show up for work for 10 days. Yet we are not allowed to expel him. We are forced to do his job. Naturally, the brigade does not earn any money from this. But not everything can be reduced to material interest, for a person also needs to rest and be with his family.

Loafers have now even developed a specific behavioral strategy. One such person was assigned to our brigade. He told me frankly: "I intend to work a couple of days and leave. They will look for me then fire me.... Time will pass and my record will show that I have worked. I will then resign and will be entitled to remain for 3 months without working. After that, I will once again work hard for a couple of days and will be left alone. I will go to the station, make 5 or 10 rubles unloading, or fuss around elsewhere. At the store, you would not refuse me a kopeck or two, or even 10."

As a result of all this, foremen, shop committee chairmen and party organizers are running around the city looking for the truants who, fired from one job immediately find another and still another. In order to take effective measures against loafers, I believe that we must have accurate and efficient information as to who is unemployed and why. In our association, individuals who have been fired by the collective are immediately reported to the employment bureau and the militia. However, this is not the case with all enterprises or organizations. Yet we are concerned with the fate of such people and with their domestic situation.

The requirement of hiring drifters exclusively through the employment bureau is not always observed. Elektrostal has many little offices and procurement and other organizations which are not necessarily under the jurisdiction of the city executive committee. Meanwhile, the "wireless telegraph" of parasites is quite efficient. Whenever the clouds over their heads gather they find shelter by taking any sort of job, regardless of salary, hiding and huddling like mice. We believe that the responsibility for decisions to hire such people should be assumed by the managers, who should also be taken to task.

It is offensive that social benefits are granted to such nonworking elements on an equal footing with honest working people. They benefit from the same free medical services, pay the same minimal rents and obtain communal services at the same low rate. Is this fair?

We, the workers, always have something to do. We are creating the future. The successful building of communism depends on our labor, cohesion, organization and initiative. Therefore, everyone must upgrade his personal responsibility for assignments and conscientiously fulfill his obligations. If everyone were to receive benefits only consistent with his work, our possibilities would be better used in the interest of the entire society. We can no longer treat softly those who prevent us from living and working, for it is useless to try to convince those who, like Vas'ka the Cat, do not work but "listen for food" and, furthermore, for drinks.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/5

## BOOK ON THE RUSSIAN TRANSLATOR OF 'DAS KAPITAL,' MARX'S FRIEND

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84) pp 116-118

[Review by L. Golovanov, candidate of philosophical sciences, of the book "Pervyy Russkiy Perevodchik 'Kapitala'" [The First Russian Translator of "Das Kapital"] by O. A. Saykin. Mysl', Moscow, 1983, 173 pp]

[Text] The adjective "ardent," which we frequently use in speaking of the fighters for the liberation of the working people, characterizes most accurately the first translator of Marx's "Das Kapital" into Russian. The heightened interest which a book about him triggers is entirely natural. The author has used extensive historical data. He himself, after thorough archive research, discovered and put in scientific circulation a number of valuable documents which have substantially added to our knowledge of German Aleksandrovich Lopatin (1845-1918). Now we have a book which describes in detail the bright life of one of the closest friends of the founders of scientific communism, a life crowded with dramatic conflicts.

"There are few people I love and respect as much as I do him," Marx wrote about Lopatin" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 33, p 403). Lopatin holds a noted place among the outstanding leaders not only of the Russian but the world revolutionary movement. There was virtually no revolutionary organization with which he was not connected in the 1860s-1880s. During his first escape from detention, and away from Russia (1870) Lopatin performed a daring deed: he kidnapped from his Vologoda exile P. L. Lavrov, the noted revolutionary, sociologist and publicist, and helped him to escape abroad. In 1871 he made a daring attempt to free N. G. Chernyshevskiy. As an emigre he participated in the labor movements of Britain, France, Germany and Switzerland. He was an active member of the General Council of the First International, where he defended the political line followed by Marx and Engels. "All of Lopatin's activities abroad," the author says, "were aimed at broadening international relations with revolutionary Russia and enriching its experience. Such activities left major traces in the history of the Russian and the Western European liberation movements" (p 83).

After tsarism routed the People's Will Party, and after consulting with Engels, Lopatin energetically undertook to rebuild it. His last imprisonment in the Petropavlovsk and Shlisselburg fortresses lasted more than 20 years and



came to an end only with the first Russian revolution. The fierce reprisals taken against Lopatin did not break his spirit. Korolenko, who met him in 1907, wrote that "this is an entire epic: the history of a person who, from the heights of European life, and after knowing Marx personally, found himself in a Siberian jail, with spectacular escapes worthy of the heroes described by Aimard and de Montepin" (p 147).

The events of this truly ardent life are accurately reflected in the context of historical events and in close connection with the fate of other revolutionary heroes. The author clearly proves that the "deep revolutionary convictions, based on a knowledge of scientific socialism, guided Lopatin's actions and steps" (p 107).

The center of all of his activities was the translation of Marx's main political economy work. The author points out that shortly before that it had proved to be more than M. A. Bakunin could handle, although the latter had signed a contract with the publisher and had even received an advance. The difficulties lay not only in the complexity of the topic but also the need to master the Logic (with a capital letter!) of "Das Kapital," whose author had used dialectics and the theory of materialism in political economy, borrowed "everything valuable Hegel had" and moved "everything valuable ahead" (see V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 29, p 301).

In undertaking the translation, Lopatin consulted with Marx directly and made a thorough study of the scientific text. In the library of the British Museum he studied the sources to which Marx referred and consulted with the latter on refining the text. Occasionally, the translator introduced his own comments to the Russian text, after clearing them with the author.

Lopatin deserves unquestionable credit for developing the method for the translation of "Das Kapital," he introduced into the Russian language the most important Marxist political economic categories. It was precisely this which subsequently enabled his friends N. F. Daniyel'son and N. N. Lyubabin to complete that which he was unable to accomplish because of his imprisonment. Let us point out that the development of a national terminology in any science is, in itself, a scientific accomplishment. This alone makes the translation of "Das Kapital" a true landmark in the history of Russian economic thought and culture in general. The book under review should have emphasized this aspect more.

Generally speaking, as the author justifiably points out, Lopatin's familiarity with the worker movement, the experience he gained as a result of his practical participation in it and his understanding, unlike the populist revolutionaries, of the mission of the proletariat on an international scale, "were factors which greatly contributed to his ideological rapprochement with Marx" (although, obviously, to put it more accurately, it was precisely his friendship with Marx and Engels which assisted Lopatin's ideological growth and his realization of the motive forces of history), and "helped him in his successful work with the translation" (pp 27-28). The great knowledge which the translator had in the humanities and the natural sciences contributed to the solution of this complex problem as well. Outstanding Russian writers who

knew him personally, such as I. S. Turgenev, G. I. Uspenskiy and A. M. Gorkiy, had noticed his great literary talent. This as well played a certain role.

We can only agree with the author that Lopatin, whose political outlook was broader and more consistent than that of his comrades, "was one of the first people in Russia to acknowledge Marxism as the only true theory of scientific socialism and thus to hold positions close to those held by Marx and Engels" (p 60) and that more than any other Russian revolutionary, he had "experienced personally the tremendous (let us add, personal--the author) influence of the founders of scientific socialism and their great ideas, and that he was the best-trained and Marxist-educated personality in the Russian liberation movement of his time and an able propagandist of Marxism" ( p 93). "Marx saw in his Russian friend his fellow worker, who had mastered the theory of scientific socialism, who shared it and who propagandized it skillfully" (ibid.). These conclusions are based on documentary sources.

In this light we are puzzled by some stipulations we find in the book such as, for example, that "Lopatin did not consider himself a populist. This does not mean in the least that he had discarded his populist convictions entirely. Lopatin's world outlook was quite complex" (p 85); the "ideas of utopian socialism were characteristic of his world outlook" (p 153). What is the author referring to, what "ideas" and "convictions," and what precisely was "complex"? The questions are not answered. Such important conclusions in a scientific monograph must be substantiated. Nor do the excerpts we cited agree with the view of V. I. Sukhomlin, who was Lopatin's closest brother-in-arms in rebuilding the People's Will Party, and who was soon to share Lopatin's tragic fate, as cited by the author: "I would rather say that German Aleksandrovich, as a Western European-type socialist and, furthermore, Karl Marx's friend and admirer, did not share our populist beliefs...." (p 122). Such categorical stipulations are nothing but a tribute to the old and false speculative interpretations which distort the actual spiritual nature of the translator of "Das Kapital" (see, for example, the BSE [Unabridged Soviet Encyclopedia], first edition, vol 37, Moscow, 1938, p 404: "However, Lopatin never understood Marxism and to the end of his days remained the prisoner of populist ideology, which was hostile to Marxism-Leninism").

In fact, Lopatin was ahead of "his Russian fellow workers in the revolutionary struggle in their advance toward Marxism" (we can only agree with this conclusion drawn by V. Oskotskiy in his review of the book on Lopatin by Yu. V. Davydov, see NOVYY MIR, No 12, 1983, p 249) and assumed the leadership of People's Will, openly disagreeing with the program of the narodovol'tsy, with a view to energizing the political struggle against tsarism under the conditions of the reaction which followed the defeat of the 1 March movement. Guided by the assessment which Marx and Engels had made of the situation which had developed in Russian in the 1880s, he tried to organize the revolutionary forces for making not a socialist but a bourgeois-democratic revolution.<sup>1</sup> The author does not mention that the first person to prove this convincingly was historian V. F. Antonov in his book "Russkiy Drug Marksa" [Marx's Russian Friend] (Sotsekgiz, Moscow, 1962, 93 pp). As we know, this work played a decisive role in changing the prevailing views on Lopatin. It answered the main and essential questions whereas the book under review merely develops these solutions on the basis of additional factual data which, unquestionably,

is useful. What is puzzling is that we find in the extensive bibliography cited merely two references to V. F. Antonov, on insignificant matters at that. No references whatsoever are made to many important documentary works by writer Yu. V. Davydov published in periodicals. In 1983 Davydov published his novel "Dve Svyazki Pisem" [Two Bundles of Letters] (Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 463 pp), which is not merely a work of literature but a major comprehensive study containing an entire series of important conclusions. Nor do we find a reference to the many years of research conducted by Yelena Brunovna Lopatina, granddaughter of the translator of "Das Kapital," published in various periodicals (see, for example, STAVROPOL'YE, No 2, 1977; "Osvoboditel'noye Dvizheniye v Rossii" [The Liberation Movement in Russia]. Inter-VUZ scientific collection. No 10. Saratov, 1981, and others), the dissertation by L. T. Senchakova "People's Will in the First Half of the 1880s (1881-1884)," which was defended at State Moscow University in 1967 (a first presentation of a scrupulous study of Lopatin's most important practical accomplishment--his activities in 1883-1884), the prewar article by N. K. Karatayev on the scientific aspect of the matter in Lopatin's activities (see ISTORIK-MARKSIST, Nos 11-12, 1940) and others. It is against such a background that we are saddened by the author's deliberate emphasis on "We determined...." or "We found out...." (not always sufficiently substantiated). As we know, neglecting or belittling the merits of predecessors is not consistent with ethical norms universally accepted in science although, unfortunately, such cases may still be found.

Equally annoying are some inaccuracies (the "Rublev Society" is described as revolutionary, although it was essentially not, p 9; Lopatin's statement on possible difficulties to be encountered in understanding the first chapter of "Das Kapital," by the public at large is presented as...a consequence of the difficulties experienced by the translator himself, p 25, etc.).

Unquestionably, the publication of a book on one of the most outstanding revolutionary heroes is a positive action by the publishing house. The study of his life and activities clearly proves the profound meaning of Lenin's conclusion: Russia truly experienced Marxism, as the only true revolutionary theory, through half a century of unparalleled pain and sacrifice, unparalleled revolutionary heroism and incredible energy and dedicated searching...." (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works, vol 41, p 8). The honorable task that Soviet historiography is faced with is to engage in further profound studies of the comprehensive activities of those who promoted our revolutionary past. This includes the topic of Lopatin as well. Let us wish that both present and future authors maintain a suitable scientific, moral and literary standards in their works, fully consistent with the noble and responsible nature of the problems they resolve.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. The following statement made by German Lopatin is of essential significance in characterizing his world outlook and political views:  
"Marx never expressed to me either categorically or even in a specific manner his hope that the Russian communal system would help Russia to bypass the capitalist stage of development. I do not think that he believed this even for a minute" ("Russkiye Sovremenniki o K. Markse i F. Engel'se" [Russian Contemporaries on Marx and Engels]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1969, 335 pp).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/5

## PERFECTING SOCIALIST ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT: THEORY, PRACTICE, PROBLEMS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84) pp 118-123

[Review by Dr of Economic Sciences Prof V. Cherkovets, honored worker in sciences of the RSFSR, of the book "Upravleniye Sotsialisticheskim Proizvostvom: Problemy Teorii i Praktiki" [Socialist Production Management: Problems of Theory and Practice] by V. A. Medvedev. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 270 pp]

[Text] The advantages of the socialist socioeconomic system have been confirmed by its nearly 70-year-old history. Entering the stage of developed socialism leads to the even greater identification of these advantages and the potential of the planned economic system. The development, advancement and enhancement of the maturity of socialist production relations also means the expanded reproduction of their inner constructive potential. The latter, however, is not achieved automatically. This should be taken into consideration in formulating and resolving of the main problems of improving the system of planned economic management and the coordination of the entire mechanism of socialist economic management.

Production efficiency and the establishment of a real correlation between results and outlays largely depend on whether we manage well or poorly. The achievements of scientific and technical progress are realized in the live and specific practices of economic management and the forms of dynamics of production forces and production relations which are established. The economic mechanism plays a tremendous role in the functioning and development of socialism as the first phase of the communist society. This determines the exceptional importance of the steady improvement of our economic management system.

The book under review deals precisely with this major problem of building socialism and communism. The author focuses his attention on the characteristics of the latest stage in the development of the economic mechanism. He traces its advent to the end of the 1970s and beginning of 1980s, when a number of most important party and government decrees on problems of economic management were passed on the basis of the resolutions of the 25th and 26th CPSU Congresses.

In describing the specifics of the current stage, V. A. Medvedev singles out the following key points: (a) the comprehensive solutions of problems of improving the economic mechanism; (b) making the mechanism consistent with the conditions of developed socialism. It was precisely these two aspects which were particularly emphasized at the December 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The author clearly formulates his attitude toward the concept of "economic mechanism" as a prerequisite for a developed study of such characteristics, which runs throughout the book and gives it its integrity and primary political-economic coloring. According to this concept, the economic mechanism in socialist society is the "sum total of organizational structures of the socialist national economy and the means and methods of managing it, consciously developed and applied by society on the basis of economic laws and in accordance with specific developing circumstances" (p 49). In developing this formula, the author explains the correlation between the economic mechanism, on the one hand, and production forces, production relations and the superstructure, on the other. Thus, the "organizational structures" reflect the level, the internal organization and structure of production forces. Furthermore, since production management has a dual nature and performs not only organizational-technical but also specifically socioeconomic functions (stemming from dominating production relations) we can only agree with the author that the economic mechanism "directly includes specific forms of production relations, found on the surface of phenomena, such as plan, norm, standard, economic assessments of resources, finances and credit, cost accounting, price, profit, wage, bonus, etc. Combined, they act both as objective economic categories and methods of economic management, management levers and forms of utilization of socialist economic laws" (p 51). The economic mechanism, therefore, is both a mechanism of action and utilization of economic laws. Base and superstructural phenomena are closely interwoven within it. This applies in particular to legal relations and direct economic management activities performed by the socialist state. The latter, as the author justifiably emphasizes, in addition to its political functions, "performs the functions of a single economic sector which manages the economic system, i.e., the base functions" (p 53).

What does a comprehensive approach to improving the economic mechanism mean, and why has its application become an absolute, an urgent requirement at the present stage?

The comprehensive approach to improving the economic mechanism is related above all to the fact that in itself the structure of this mechanism has become quite complex, internally divided, multiple-tiered and multicomponent. The coordination of all of its parts in such a way as to enable them to function in a synchronized manner and in the same direction and for the organizational structure of management to be consistent with the characteristics and tasks of each level and unit of socialist economic management and for the applied means, methods and incentives for economic activities to constitute a unified system based on the system of production relations is the essence of this comprehensiveness.

The need for a comprehensive approach to improving the economic mechanism, which stems directly from the specific condition of socialist production relations (reflecting in a concentrated way this mechanism through economic tasks and the social policies of the communist party and the Soviet state) is, in the final account, objectively determined by the level reached in the development of production forces. For that reason the book properly begins with a description of their present level and degree of development of their social nature, consistent with the stage of development of the scientific and technical revolution. In the introduction itself, the author stresses (see p 3) and, subsequently, systematically promotes throughout the rest of the book the concept that the entire comprehensive process of perfecting the economic system of socialist society (and, therefore, its economic mechanism as well) is based on the development of material production.

This methodological emphasis which may seem to be the self-evident consequence of the elementary Marxist truth of the primacy of material production in social development is, in our view, quite relevant and entirely purposeful. The point is that in sociological (including political-economic) literature, concepts which lead to the erosion of the main division between material and nonmaterial production may occasionally be found and even become somewhat popular; occasionally the concept of the conversion of the determining role in the development of contemporary society to nonmaterial production or, going even further, to spiritual production is promoted. V. A. Medvedev convincingly proves that material production plays the main role in the solution of problems such as improving the material well-being and the comprehensive development of the individual, the gradual elimination of class disparities, and approaching total social equality, achieving high efficiency and determining the historical outcome of the competition between capitalism and socialism in the international arena. It is precisely in this area that, metaphorically speaking, runs the axis of the advancement of the entire economic management mechanism of socialist society under current conditions (which, naturally, does not mean in the least a belittling of the importance of improving work in the nonproduction area or denying the growing role of the latter in the enhancement of material production itself).

Unquestionably, the comprehensive approach to adjusting the economic mechanism is closely related to the very nature of the socialist economic system and to the fact that the basic means of production are concentrated in the hands of the society of associated working people and that, on this basis, for the first time in history economic management by the whole people appears and develops, originating from a single center. The essential enhancement of the level of maturity of labor, which is directly socialized on a national economic scale, as the initial socioeconomic foundation for developed socialism, means an increase in the objective need for a comprehensive approach to the mechanism of socialist economic management and its advancement. From this viewpoint, the great attention which the author pays to the establishment and development of the single national economic complex as a result of quality changes in production forces, occurring under the influence of the contemporary stage in the scientific and technical revolution, is entirely justified.



The concept of the country's single national economic complex is relatively new. It appeared in connection with the elaboration of the concept of developed socialism and was included in the 1977 USSR Constitution. Not all aspects of this problem have been entirely clarified and a creative discussion is continuing in scientific publications on some of them, including the basic definition of the complex. The book by V. A. Medvedev brings forth convincing arguments in favor of the viewpoint found in economic publications, according to which the shaping of a single national economic complex should be related to the further development of the public nature of production forces and technological and economic socialization, which provide a material foundation more consistent with ownership by the whole people and face the planned management of the state of the whole people with new tasks which require a strictly coordinated and balanced approach for their resolution. In the opinion of the author, the single national economic complex is a "qualitatively new stage in the intensification of the public nature of production," the main feature of which is the "comprehensive integration on all levels and in all areas of the national economy and the increased intensiveness of national economic relations" (p 12). It is in this connection that V. A. Medvedev analyzes the profound changes which have taken place in the sectorial structure of the production process (the appearance of the latest sectors and the enhanced role of sectors servicing the basic trends in the scientific and technical process), processes such as combining and completing the creation of production associations, intensified specialization of economic rayons, establishment of territorial-production and intersectorial production complexes (agroindustrial in particular) and development of the production infrastructure. The author, who emphasizes that "production integration affects not only material production factors but manpower as well," discusses the intensively developing process of the establishment of "combined manpower on a social scale" (p 14).

Therefore, under the conditions of the existing unified national economic complex, the objective grounds for an approach to improving the management system, which would exclude one-sided disparate actions aimed at improving individual units and elements of the economic mechanism, is intensified, not only from the aspect of the social form but of the material and technical-economic content of the production process as well.

The author studies in different degrees of detail a number of topical problems of upgrading the efficiency of economic management, which require interrelated steps for their resolution.

Among them he gives priority to improving the organizational structure of management, in the belief that it is precisely they which provide the "necessary prerequisite and a condition for the efficiency of all other components of the economic mechanism" (p 67). The exceptional importance of this area is unquestionable. In our view, however, the organizational structure of management as a whole must be determined essentially by resolving the problem of the correlation between centralized planning, on the one hand, and the autonomy of "primary" (cost-accounting) production units (enterprises, associations), on the other. National economic planning is the core of the system of socialist economic management. This directly stems from the nature of ownership by the whole people. At the same time, improvements in the

entire system of planning and centralized economic management should ensure an objectively determined measure of relative autonomy in managing production and the reproduction of the primary subject of economic management, as stipulated by the planned economy and theoretically predetermined.

The author himself ascribes great importance to this matter. Thus, Chapter 6 deals especially with improving the democratic foundations of production management within the framework of their essential principle--democratic centralism. V. A. Medvedev proves that self-management in economics begins to develop during the socialist phase of communism and that such development "should not be postponed until the advent of the higher phase" (p 209). He accurately believes that said process does not weaken but "strengthens state management" (p 210). Let us particularly note that V. A. Medvedev actively opposes an interpretation of this matter according to which the development of the democratic foundations of production management and the autonomy and responsibility of associations and enterprises is identified with broadening the realm of action and intensifying commodity-monetary relations (see pp 206-207). In our view, the author accurately believes that according to such a logic the direct social nature of the production process is reduced to centralism and deprived of a democratic content. It is erroneous and one-sided, V. A. Medvedev emphasizes, to depict the socialist enterprise or association "merely as a commodity producer." They are, above all, links in the single nationwide cooperation which is the realization of the socialist ownership of means of production and, above all, the promoters of the nationwide interest. On the other hand, this does not negate in the least the need for a better utilization of commodity-monetary and cost-accounting relations.

The search of ways leading to the comprehensive improvement of the economic mechanism should be based on knowledge of the objective content and structure of socialist production relations and economic laws. This precisely is the core of the question of the consistency between the economic mechanism and the level reached in the historical evolution of the first phase of the communist society. Here the realistic approach which is urgently demanded of the social scientists involved in drafting the new edition of the party's program, and in the speeches of Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU General Secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, presumes a specific consideration precisely of the characteristics of the beginning of the developed socialist stage. This is an exceptionally important aspect, if we bear in mind the extent and depth of constructive work which must be accomplished by developed socialism in order to take society to the level of the higher communist phase. A long historical "distance" separates developed socialism "at the start" and its nature at the "finish."

The improvement of the economic mechanism is a problem which can be successfully resolved only on the firm theoretical base of the concept of the developed socialist society. The methodological and theoretical problem which arises is one of concretizing the political-economic content of this concept by organically including within it the concept of the systematic improvement of the economic management mechanism and ensuring its total consistency with the economic base at the initial level of the stage of maturity of the first phase of the communist system. It is no accident that the development of the

theoretical foundations for the comprehensive advancement of national economic management and planning is described in the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Upgrading the Role of the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences in the Elaboration of the Crucial Problems of Economic Theory of Developed Socialism" as one of the most important trends in the science of economics. The main feature of this work is precisely to develop the type of socialist political economy which could "build a bridge" between the economic laws of socialism and direct economic management and create a theoretical model, coordinated in all aspects, which would reflect the forms of realization of profound production relations, which are coming to the surface of economic life.

In our view, the absence of such a model is one of the factors for the preservation of a certain "disparity" in the economic mechanisms functioning in the various large material production areas and sectors. V. A. Medvedev justifiably points out that "the characteristic feature of the new stage in the advancement of the economic mechanism is the simultaneous implementation of respective measures in the basic national economic sectors: industry, construction, agriculture and transportation" (p 71). Naturally, the specific nature of the sector is of great importance. However, an economic mechanism based on the planned organization of production under the conditions of a fully established national economic complex can be only one and must involve essentially the same means and methods of management. The lack of coordination among economic managements in different sectors and the excessive emphasis put on their technological characteristics are inadmissible today.

"Breaches" in the overall concept of the economic mechanism appear also in the efforts to "design" a multiplicity of mechanisms "related" to the solution of individual albeit most important national economic problems. Thus, we are familiar with numerous variants in substantiating the need for a number of "special" management mechanisms for scientific and technical progress, production quality, production efficiency, capital investments, etc. In our view, such an approach can only contribute to the "splintering" of the single economic mechanism and the discoordinated functioning of its individual parts. The following question arises: Is it not the purpose of the single economic mechanism to resolve problems of scientific and technical progress, upgrading production quality, etc.? If, as confirmed by historical experience, the market mechanism resolves (one way or another) such problems simultaneously, why is it that a planned mechanism "upsets" such a solution? On the other hand, this does not eliminate in the least the problem of the different structural levels of economic management and their interconnection, as well as the fact that their absolute identification is erroneous.

The fact that these and similar problems (including the ways and means of eliminating imbalances and shortages in the national economy, extensively discussed in Chapter 5) are the "lot" precisely of socialist political economy should be reemphasized in connection with the following: occasionally, attempts are made to separate the theory of the economic mechanism from political economy, to consider it outside the latter and to present it as some kind of intermediary link between "abstract theory" and "practice." Such "indirect" connection between political economy and practical work means, actually, a separation between them, i.e., neglecting profound production

relations and economic laws in formulating programs for improving the economic mechanism. In our view, the scientifically accurate alternate solution is to formulate a special theory of the economic mechanism within the framework of the system of political economic categories and laws.

What makes V. A. Medvedev's book valuable is its close ties with socialist political economy. According to the author, the need to improve the economic mechanism raises major problems for economic theory and emphasizes aspects within it which remain insufficiently developed and require further clarification. One such problem is that of commodity-monetary relations, "dialectically interacting with the direct social content of socialist relations" (p 255). In analyzing this objective dialectics, the author convincingly proves that commodity-monetary relations, which do not define the basic nature of socialist production, which is directly social, remain an essential element of the economic system at the developed socialist stage. The theoretically and practically most topical task of political economy, therefore, is, while bringing to light the tools used in direct social production control, "to depict its interwoven and interacting nature with commodity-value forms and real role within the economic mechanism" (p 251). The problems caused "by such an interwoven heterogeneous economic base (revealed in the fact that, on the one hand, the influence of commodity-monetary relations' is revealed with greater or lesser emphasis, in categories which are geneologically related to direct social relations..., and, on the other, 'in categories which owe their origin to commodity production, may be manifested in direct social relations as well') require detailed and specific study" (pp 255-256).

Proceeding from the direct social nature of socialist production, the author justifiably describes the need for socialist political economy to pay greater attention to problems of consumer value (see pp 247-251). In our view, however, he should have specified the precise sense in which consumer value (such as "usefulness of objects" and, consequently, as the attitude of the person toward objects) which is of interest to a science whose direct object is production relations among people. We know that, in refuting the view according to which consumer value plays no role whatsoever in his theory of value, K. Marx raised the question not simply of "consumer value" but of the "consumer value to others" (i.e., of "public consumer value") and, furthermore, the "consumer value of the 'commodity'," possessing a "specifically historical nature" (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 19, p 385), in the nature of a concealed social consumer value. Socialist political economy should deal with the "specifically historical nature" of consumer value, which is essentially different from that under capitalism. In other words, in the matter of consumer value, the main point is that immanent social form of the product which develops under socialism in replacing the commodity, the commodity form. The author writes about the "direct social product" (p 242). Unquestionably, this is a most important socialist economic category. Yet its characteristic (as that of the commodity) is the consumer value, the socioeconomic "definition" of which that it is a direct-social consumer value. In this case we note a reflected, a secondary "illumination" of consumer value which, by virtue of the socialist direct social relations assigned to it, performs the role of economic category.

The author pays considerable attention to problems of the basic economic law of socialism, the objective of socialist production, the law of planned development and production efficiency.

On the question of determining the latter, in our view the author accurately notes disparities of views in economic publications and the erroneousness of limiting the question of production efficiency to specific individual problems. However, he should have expressed his own view on the "political-economic interpretation of production efficiency" suggested in his book. "The approach methodology" to the problem, found in Marx's "Das Kapital," consists, in the author's view of the fact that production efficiency is expressed under capitalism through the norm of capital profit (see p 243). The latter, however, as we know, is the converted form of the added value norm in which (in the exploitation norm) the profound criterion of capitalist production efficiency is manifested, based on the main economic law of capitalism. Therefore, the methodology suggested by the author could be interpreted as directing us toward understanding production efficiency only as a converted, a superficial category, which is questionable. Clearly, the author has paid somewhat insufficient attention to labor productivity which, in our view, is the most general form of efficiency. His justified appeal for integral and comprehensive consideration of outlays in determining production efficiency (see p 245) is not supported by the study of its various combinations based on the principle of the integration of heterogeneous costs.

The publication of V. A. Medvedev's new book is of unquestionable interest in terms of economic theory and economic management practice. The author raises crucial problems of the management of our economy and discusses sharp controversial problems of socialist political economy.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/5

## WORKING CLASS HISTORIAN

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84) pp 123-125

[Review by L. Badya, candidate of historical sciences, of the book "Rabochiy Klass Rossii" [The Russian Working Class]. Selected works by A. M. Pankratova. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 559 pp].

[Text] Academician Anna Mikhaylovna Pankratova (1897-1957), the anthology of whose selected works was published recently, had an amazing life. The daughter of an Odessa worker, familiar from an early age with need and hard work, she became a member of clandestine circles in high school. During the civil war, Anna Pankratova ("Nyura Palich") was an active member and, subsequently, one of the leaders of the Odessa bolshevik underground. The young party member had the luck to see and hear V. I. Lenin. The first time this occurred was in May 1919, at the first all-Russian congress on extracurricular education, which Lenin addressed twice. "This encounter with V. I. Lenin defined my entire subsequent life and made me think even more firmly of how better to utilize my forces and energy in building the new socialist life and culture," she wrote many years later. A. M. Pankratova heard Lenin speak once more, at the 10th Party Congress, in the wake of which she was assigned to trade union work in the Urals.

Work in mass professional organizations required not only energy, initiative and organizational ability but extensive knowledge as well. In preparing her addresses to workers, Pankratova used materials from plant files. "Already then I was extensively thinking of the historical destinies of our Russian proletariat," she recalled in a letter to her teacher, M. N. Pokrovskiy.

In 1922 A. M. Pankratova entered the Red Professorship Institute and 1 year later published her first monograph ("Fabzavkomy Rossii v Bor'be za Sotsialisticheskuyu Fabriku" [Russian Factory and Plant Committees in the Struggle for a Socialist Factory]. Moscow, 1923). This book was based on the author's experience acquired in the course of her work in the Urals and mainly on the needs of the period, when the question of the role and tasks of the trade unions was one of the most important and difficult in the theory and practice of the building of socialism in the USSR and the international worker movement. In continuing the tradition of Marxist historiography of Russia, in her studies on the history of domestic and, subsequently, Western European

mass proletarian organizations, Pankratova was fulfilling her international duty as a scientist.

The list of her works, which begins with her 1923 book on factory-plant committees, is crowned by her monograph "Formirovaniye Proletariata v Rossii (XVII-XVIII Vv.)" [Establishment of the Proletariat in Russia (17th-18th Centuries)], which was published in 1963. She was the author of more than 200 works. In recognition of her dedicated scientific work and organizational, pedagogical and editorial activities, in 1939 A. M. Pankratova was elected corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and became full member in 1953. She was the bearer of state awards and was granted the title of USSR State Prize Laureate. Her tremendous social activities are known: A. M. Pankratova was member of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Pankratova had a variety of scientific interests: she worked in the field of the history of diplomacy, participated in the writing of definitive works on the history of union republics and was the editor and one of the authors of the first Soviet textbooks on domestic history. Throughout her life, however, she considered as her main objective the study of the history of the most progressive class of all times--the proletariat--and its revolutionary struggle.

The anthology under review includes A. M. Pankratova's works written between 1925 and 1956. They reflect the main trends of her studies of the working class in Russia: Marxist-Leninist methodology and method in the study of the history of the proletariat and industrial enterprises, the history of the working class on the eve of and during the first Russian revolution, and problems related to the establishment of the working class in our country. In the book under review the articles are presented chronologically. This enables us to follow the creative efforts of the author in their progress and the manner in which she perfected her approach to resolving one problem or another and enriched her research method as she intensified her study of a problem.

Justifiably considered the leading Soviet researcher in the history of the Russian proletariat, throughout her entire creative career Pankratova paid great attention to methodological problems. She was the first person in Soviet historiography to present the concise views of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the history of the working class in her programmatic article "The Problem of the Study of the History of the Proletariat" (1930) and to assign to historians the task of the further study of their works on this topic. She approached the problem on a broader basis several years later in her articles on writing the history of factories and plants, in which the Marxist-Leninist concept of the history of the proletariat was discussed in close connection with Lenin's theory of the development of capitalism in Russia. Pankratova's fundamental article "Marx and Engels on the Historical Role of the Proletariat" came out in 1933.

She was among the first Soviet historians to undertake the study of the creative laboratories of Marx and Lenin: in its 1 July 1939 PRAVDA published her article "Great School of Scientific-Theoretical Work."



The methodological articles included in the anthology contain a considered and scientifically substantiated program for the study of the history of the working class in prerevolutionary Russia. The research topic here is the proletariat, from the time of its birth to its transformation into a "class for itself." Pankratova suggests a breakdown of the process of its formation during the age of capitalism and earmarks a set of problems to be studied, which include the economic status of the working class, its quantitative and qualitative composition, the forms and nature of the labor movement, the establishment of proletarian organizations, the ideology of the working class and the role of the Bolshevik Party in leading its struggle during the different stages of Russian history. Many of the methodological problems which A. M. Pankratova raised at that time continued to be topics of major scientific debates over long periods of time and led to the publication of a number of valuable works.

Some of them were written by A. M. Pankratova herself. What interested her most was the complex and still discussed problem of the shaping of the proletariat. The works in the anthology reflect only part of the tremendous amount of the author's work on a multiple-volume history of our homeland's working class, which she was unable to complete. Extensive and profoundly meaningful articles, such as "Worker Disturbances in Serfdom Russia in the First Half of the 19th Century," "Proletarianization of the Peasantry and Its Role in Forming an Industrial Proletariat in Russia," and "Dissemination of the Ideas of Socialism Among Workers in Russia in the 1870s-1880s," cover important stages in the establishment of worker cadres against the background of the country's 19th century socioeconomic development and the birth and development of the class struggle waged by the proletariat, the growth of the workers' self-awareness and laying the foundations for blending the labor movement with scientific socialism. These articles, along with other studies, are an important contribution by A. M. Pankratova to writing the biography of the working class in the USSR.

The value of this academician's works, the works of a scientist of great erudition and scientific courage, is that, while resolving immediate research problems, she did not avoid answering a number of parallel questions, some of which of great importance to historiography: the establishment of an all-Russian market in the country, the role of commodity production in the transition from feudalism to capitalism, the period of industrial change in Russia, the reasons which encouraged or held back the abandonment of communities by the peasants after the 1861 reform, and others. The arguments on which she based her conclusions on debatable problems are actively used to this day.

Pankratova's study of the history of the preparations for and making of the 1905-1907 revolution (more than 40) remain topical. The collection includes four of her articles on the 1905-1907 revolution. They reflect the main stages and trends of the scientist's work on that problem. In her analysis of the first Russian revolution on a countrywide scale, Pankratova paid great attention to the study of its prerequisites, individual events, features of the strikes and participation of the separate proletarian detachments in the revolution. Articles such as "The Working Class and the Worker Movement on

the Eve of the 1905 Revolution" (1925) and "Textile Workers in the 1905-1907 Revolution" (1930), impressive in terms of their presentation, have remained relevant and scientifically significant to this day.

Pankratova not only organized but participated in the study of the history of factories and plants in the USSR. One of the results of such studies was her original article "The Serp i Molot Plant Workers in 1905." This is a study of 200 surveys of old workers, who were veterans of the 1905 events. Pankratova made a study of the history of the revolutionary movement at that plant. The importance of the article is that it draws attention to a complex mass source such as the biography of workers and clearly describes the method to be used in such work.

Academician A. M. Pankratova was an outstanding scientist of our time and we cannot imagine Soviet historical science of the 1920s to 1950s without her participation. The articles included in the anthology confirm the firm opinion of her as the "pioneer" of Soviet historiography. She had the ability to define the main scientific trends, inspire researchers to work on them and mobilize entire collectives of specialists to resolve most important problems. She personally undertook the study of the most difficult problems. To this day, her works are not only of historiographic importance but of great scientific value as well, for, in addition to important conclusions, they frequently include an entire program for the further study of the problem. They have had and continue to have a tremendous impact on the development of Soviet historical science.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/5

'...THE REVOLUTION NEEDS THIS'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84) pp 125-127

[Review by V. Kuz'menko of the books "Jaroslav Hasek--Zhurnal'ist" [Jaroslav Hasek--Journalist] by Zdenek Gorzheni. Raduga, Moscow, 1983, 293 pp; "Primery iz Zhizni" [Examples From Life] by Jaroslav Hasek. Progress, Moscow, 1983, 262 pp. As part of this series, Izdatel'stvo Progress has published collections of selected publicistic articles by Jean Richard Bloch, Albert Reese Williams, Andre Maurois and Ernest Hemingway, aimed at the general reading public]

[Text] "I am always assigned a great deal of work and, as soon as I start thinking that no one can invent anything more, or wonder what else I could do, circumstances arise which force me, once again, to work more and more. I do not generally object, for all of this is needed by the revolution." That is what Jaroslav Hasek wrote to one of his comrades from Irkutsk on 17 September 1920. "Very much work...." At that time, party member Hasek was carrying out important assignments for the political department of the Fifth Army on the Eastern Front. As a journalist, he edited and published simultaneously three newspapers: STURM, in German, ROGAM, in Hungarian, and UR, in Buryat-Mongolian. As a political journalist, he wrote for the front press articles, many of which were in Russian. "...The revolution needs this." Hasek responded to the events of the day by efficiently exposing the intrigues of the not entirely crushed bourgeoisie ("From the Diary of an Ufa Bourgeois," "Ufa's Ivan Ivanovich," "On the Ufa Bandit Shopkeeper Balakulin"), in which he exposed the ideological collapse of the SR ("SR Creativity") and the counterrevolutionary activities of some of the clergy ("Tragedy of a Priest")....

Together with the Red Army from 1918 to 1920, Hasek covered the combat path from Ufa to Irkutsk. No less harsh was his life, which led him to the revolution, and his creative career, which helped him to acquire journalistic and writing skills. The Soviet people, familiar with Hasek from his anti-imperialist satirical novel "The Good Soldier Schweik," will be able to read about all of this in the recently published books under review, which shed light on new facets of the immortal talent of this Czech literary classic. The first, written in a live and temperamental style by the noted Czechoslovak journalist Zdenek Gorzheni, RUDE PRAVO editor in chief, describes little-known

aspects of the courageous activities of this communist journalist. The second, which came out on the occasion of the centennial of Hasek's birth, includes selected publicistic works--articles, essays and satirical articles, some of which were published in Russian for the first time.

In his youth, Hasek was attracted by the pseudorevolutionary views of the Czech anarchists and contributed to the bourgeois and social democratic press. In World War I, after his voluntary surrender, he worked the newspapers of Czechoslovak organizations in Russia. The Great October Revolution became a turning point in his life. Hasek firmly broke with the Czechoslovak bourgeois nationalistic circles and actively joined in the defense of the socialist revolution. He joined the Bolshevik Party in March 1918 and entered the ranks of the Czechoslovak left-wing social democrats, who subsequently united within the Czechoslovak communist section of the RKP(b), after which he worked as political worker, editor of and contributor to Red Army newspapers working for the revolution.

Jaroslav Hasek began his creative career by writing travel notes and essays, frequently with a humorous ending, imbued with sincere love for the working people (his first essay "Gypsies on Holiday" was published on 26 January 1901). He ended his journalistic activities with a satirical article published in RUDE PRAVO in its 17 May 1922 issue. As he had frequently done in the past, the author satirically scourged the attacks which Czechoslovak reaction had mounted on young Soviet Russia. From that time on, until his death on 3 January 1923, Hasek worked on his Schweik novel, which, as it were, remained unfinished.

Hasek, who became a journalist in his teens and who died before he was 40, was able to produce more than 1,200 humorous stories, satirical articles, pamphlets, essays and other articles and a four-volume novel on the adventures of the brave soldier Schweik in World War I, two other novels, the manuscripts of which have been lost, the book "History of a Party of Moderate Progress Within the Law," several plays and a great deal of poetry. Starting as a folklore humorist, he rose to the peak of political and social satire, sensitively and sharply reacting to social events. Now the Soviet reader will be given the pleasant exposure to all this in the collection of selected articles, pamphlets and satirical articles by Jaroslav Hasek.

One of his sharpest publicistic works written before World War I was the "Political and Social History of the Moderate Progress Party," consisting of 84 chapters. In this work, the author presents a devastatingly accurate picture of the majority of the then-existing Czech political parties, with their groveling at the feet of authority, fear of the masses and alienation from the interests of the people. Some of the satirical articles from this book are included in the collection. Thus, the "Manifesto of the Moderate Progress Party Within the Law for the Latest Elections" (this witty and biting hoax was created in April 1911--the reviewer) was followed, after ironic claims that progress "ever since the historical event in the course of which the most famous Czech Columbus discovered America after sailing out of Janovic and developed within the framework of the law," while the "Svatopluc Czech Bridge... was not built in a single night," was followed by the following address to the people: "...A number of parties exist which will try to

convince you that all of this could have been accomplished in one fell swoop! Other parties, conversely, would proclaim that this would be impossible to accomplish! Who should you believe in this case? Naturally, those who point out that everything was accomplished through moderate progress, within the law" ("Examples From Life," pp 115-117). To this day, in the capitalist countries bourgeois and opportunistic parties are generous in electoral promises, hoaxing the electoral masses with that same "moderate progress within the law...."

In a satirical article entitled "The Advice I Would Give Communists Had I Been Editor in Chief of CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC, the Governmental Organ," written for RUDE PRAVO during the bourgeois republic, on behalf of this official organ, Hasek calls upon the communists to be "good little children" and imparts proper "advice." Thus, "it is unseemly to the highest degree for some communist orators to speak too loudly," for which reason it would be "desirable for speakers addressing meetings to speak more softly." Or else, "we are meeting the communist orators halfway to such an extent that we have even drafted for them a program of speeches which they could deliver at meetings and gatherings." Sample theses of speeches to be given by communist orators at May Day meetings are given: "May Day is the first day of the month of May. May is the first month of mass flower planting...." It would be outstanding, the author of the satirical article goes on to say, if demonstrators would carry posters reading "Long Live Capitalism! Your Loyal Workers." "It would then happen that May Day would become a true holiday of labor and of working people--to the greater advantage of their brother capitalists," Hasek sarcastically points out (ibid., pp 210-211). Today one could only laugh at his witty fiction, had there not been a fact recently reported in the press. It turns out that the present head of the administration in Washington has decided to put an end to the celebration of May Day as a day of international solidarity of the working people, held in memory of the bloody police massacre of workers in Chicago, on 1 May 1886. He therefore proclaimed that henceforth May Day...would be "Loyalty Day," ordering that on that day Americans "assert their loyalty to the United States." As we see, the "brother capitalists" to this day would like the participants in May Day demonstrations "not to talk too loudly," for in the opposite case they would not shy even at the most cruel terrorist measures....

The verbal statements of the imperialist "peace lovers" in favor of disarmament or, actually, their dangerous irresponsibility shown on this important problem, are described in Hasek's satirical article on an international subject, "Fateful Session of the Disarmament Conference." Its participants, stupefied by numerous banquets, and having somewhat forgotten the reason for their meeting, have begun to promote...an arms race. The work of the conference ends tragically as a result of an explosion which destroys the meeting room. Initially, the authorities thought this could be the work of anarchists. The investigation determines, however, that the explosion was not political: "The representative of a company producing explosives was waiting in the reception room on the floor below for some members of the disarmament conference in order to offer them a new explosive, washingtonite, which would be 2,000 times more effective than ecrasite and 1,000 times more effective than melinite. Mistakenly, he pulls out a box with samples instead of a matchbox and, opening it, triggers the explosion" (ibid., p 214).

Hasek got the idea for the article from a conference which the imperialist countries held in December 1921 in Washington to discuss arms limitation whereas, in fact, the conference dealt with intensifying the arms race. Today as well, the imperialists' peace-loving expatiations are merely a screen for their policy of unrestrained militarism and intensification of tension. Thus, over the past 30 years the United States has sold \$148.3 billion worth of equipment and ammunition to other countries, half of which over the past 3 years, i.e., during the present Washington administration. It is precisely Reagan's washingtonite--the deployment of American first-strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe--that blasted the foundations of the Geneva talks on limiting medium-range nuclear weapons....

Zdenek Gorzheni's book ends as follows: "Jaroslav Hasek never held a watchful or expectant, not to mention more neutral, position. The ice of indifference did not freeze his heart. He plunged into battle with enthusiasm and fierceness, dedicating himself to it fully and unreservedly, always knowing on whose side and for what he was fighting. His works--literary and publicistic--are a barricade for our side to this day" (p 278). That is the way the readers will see him in the pages of this selected artistic publicism--a communist, a fighter for the revolution and a passionate agitator and propagandist.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/5

FOLLOWING A KOMMUNIST ARTICLE

AU101301 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84)  
p 127

[Letter to the editors by V. Trukhanovskiy, editor-in-chief of the journal VOPROSY ISTORII]

[Text] To editors of the journal KOMMUNIST:

KOMMUNIST, Issue No 14 for 1984, published a review by Ye. I. Bugayev, doctor of historical sciences, entitled "Strange Position," which criticized the article by Ye. A. Ambartsumov, candidate of historical sciences, entitled "V. I. Lenin's Analysis of the Causes of the 1921 Crisis and of the Ways To Resolve It" that was published VOPROSY ISTORII, Issue No 4 for 1984.

At its expanded session in which the leadership of the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences and several well-known historians participated, the editorial collegium of the journal VOPROSY ISTORII recognized the justice of the criticism addressed to the author and the journal and outlined a number of measures to ensure the necessary scientific-methodological and political level of published articles. A decision was also adopted to prepare and publish in one of the issues of VOPROSY ISTORII in the very near future an article that will scientifically analyze the problems raised by Ye. I. Bugayev in his review.

The KOMMUNIST article has also shown that the complex of problems connected with the history of the 1921 crisis and with the transition to the new economic policy requires further scientific examination. In this connection, the editors plan to publish in the future a number of articles on the political and economic history of the Soviet state at the beginning of the 1920s.

A party meeting was held at the editorial office of the journal VOPROSY ISTORII, during which the KOMMUNIST article was discussed, and measures aimed at perfecting the work of the editorial office and increasing exactingness in preparing the appropriate articles for the journal's publication outlined.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984  
CSO: 1802/5



## OBITUARY OF IVAN PAVLOVICH POMELOV

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 84 (signed to press 21 Nov 84) p 128

[Editorial Board obituary]

[Text] The collective of KOMMUNIST has suffered a heavy loss. Ivan Pavlovich Pomelov, a retiree with a special union pension, member of the journal's editorial collegium, died on 8 November at the age of 70.

Ivan Pavlovich was born on 26 November 1914 in Pomelovy village, Darovskiy Rayon, Kirov Oblast. He began his labor career at an early age.

I. P. Pomelov became a journalist after 20 years' work as a literary contributor to the KRASNYY KHIMIK plant newspaper of the Chernorechenskiy Chemical Combine in Dzerzhinsk, Gorkiy Oblast. He worked as a journalist for several decades.

I. P. Pomelov graduated from the Communist University of Journalism imeni Vorovskiy in Leningrad in 1938 and from the VKP(b) Central Committee Higher Party School in 1946.

In 1951 Ivan Pavlovich became deputy responsible secretary and, subsequently, responsible secretary and deputy editor in chief of BOL'SHEVIK--KOMMUNIST--our party's Central Committee theoretical and political journal. It was here that his talent as party publicist and organizer reached full strength. Articles by I. P. Pomelov on topical problems of social life and party construction appeared in KOMMUNIST, PRAVDA and other central newspapers and journals on a regular basis. He authored a number of books and pamphlets on Marxist-Leninist theory and CPSU policy.

From 1966 to 1982 I. P. Pomelov held responsible positions within the CPSU Central Committee apparatus, returning to KOMMUNIST following his retirement, as head of the party life and communist education department. He was stricken suddenly by a severe illness, which forced him to abandon his beloved work to which he had dedicated his entire strength and many years of work as party worker and party journalist.

I. P. Pomelov was the recipient of the Order of the October Revolution, three orders of the Labor Red Banner, the order of Friendship Among the Peoples and

medals for his great contributions to the party and the state, and to Soviet journalism.

Throughout his conscious life, Ivan Pavlovich Pomelov honorably held the title of member of the Leninist Party, which entails high responsibility, and in the ranks of which he spent more than 4 decades. He was always distinguished by a feeling of high responsibility for assignments, exceptional industriousness, principle-mindedness and exigency toward himself and his comrades. His fellow workers knew Ivan Pavlovich as a talented journalist, an active and firm fighter for the party's cause and the ideals of communism, as a person who was morally pure and loved life greatly, qualities for which he was profoundly respected and with which he will be remembered by us forever.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/5

INDEX TO KOMMUNIST, NO. 17, NOVEMBER 1984

[The following index, compiled by JPRS, is provided as a service to its consumers.]

**B**

Bohr, Niels

- insistence on sharing nuclear secrets with USSR, 131
- letter to Roosevelt, 131

**C**

Chernenko, K. U.

- 15 November 1984 speech to Politburo, 1
- address to U.S. readers of book of articles and speeches, 28
- answers to questions from NBC correspondent, 30
- quotes from speech at Soviet Writers Congress, 83
- speech to youth leaders of socialist countries, 24

CPSU

- creative activities in culture, 82
- guidance and education of Komsomol, 50
- role as guide of Soviet society, 33

**E**

Economy

- advantages of brigade system, 12
- criticism of drunks and loafers, 140
- criticism of employment bureaus, 140
- Marx's theory of abstract labor, 66
- new machine-building enterprise brigade system, 140
- overview, 12
- problems in industry, 140
- scientific economic management book review, 154

**G**

Gorbachev, I.

- named as participant in writers' plenum jubilee, 83

**H**

Hasek, Jaroslav

- journalistic works published, 166

**I**

Ideology

- role of democracy in Soviet society, 33
- role of soviets in Soviet democracy, 33

## K

Komsomol

guidance by the CPSU, 50

role in Soviet political system, 33

## L

Lopatin, Aleksandrovich

first Russian translator of "Das Kapital", 149

## N

Nicaragua

threatened by U.S. aggression, 136

## P

Pankratova, A. M.

works on Russian working class reviewed, 162

Pomelov, Ivan Pavlovich

obituary, 171

## S

Sen Katayama

biographic article on, 97

Shcherbitskiy, V.

article on Soviet democracy, 33

## U

United States

criticized for use of atom bomb, 131

scorn for Allies' interests, 131

## V

VOPROSY ISTORII

apology for article on 1921 crisis, 170

END